101ST CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

EXEC. REPT.
101-29

INCOME TAX CONVENTION WITH THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ON

TREATY DOC. 101-16, 101ST CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, INCOME TAX CONVENTION WITH SPAIN, WITH PROTOCOL

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1990.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

39-119 WASHINGTON : 1990

5384-8

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
I. Purpose	1
II. Background	1
III. Summary	2
IV. Date of Entry Into Force and Termination	11
V. Committee Action	11
VI. Committee Comments	11
VII. Budget Impact	19
VIII. Explanation of Treaty Provisions	19
Article 1. General Scope	19
Article 2. Taxes Covered	21
Article 3. General Definitions	24
Article 4. Residence	25
Article 5. Permanent Establishment	27
Article 6. Income From Real Property (Immovable Property)	28
Article 7. Business Profits	29
Article 8. Shipping and Air Transport	32
Article 9. Associated Enterprises	33
Article 10. Dividends	34
Article 11. Interest	36
Article 12. Royalties	38
Article 13. Capital Gains	40
Article 14. Branch Tax	42
Article 15. Independent Personal Services	44
Article 16. Dependent Personal Services	46
Article 17. Limitation on Benefits	46
Article 18. Directors' Fees	48
Article 19. Artistes and Athletes	48
Article 20. Pensions, Annuities, Alimony, and Child Support	49
Article 21. Government Service	50
Article 22. Students and Trainees	51
Article 23. Other Income	52
Article 24. Relief From Double Taxation	52
Article 25. Non-Discrimination	55
Article 26. Mutual Agreement Procedure	56
Article 27. Exchange of Information and Administrative Assistance	57
Article 28. Diplomatic Agents and Consular Officers	58
Article 29. Entry Into Force	59
Article 30. Termination	59
IX. Text of the Resolution of Ratification	59

101ST CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

EXEC. REPORT
101-29

INCOME TAX CONVENTION WITH SPAIN, WITH PROTOCOL

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1990.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany Treaty Doc. 101-16, 101st Congress, 2d Session]

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, together with a related protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification thereof.

I. PURPOSE

The principal purposes of the proposed income tax treaty between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain are to reduce or eliminate double taxation of income earned by citizens and residents of either country from sources within the other country, and to prevent avoidance or evasion of the income taxes of the two countries. The proposed treaty is intended to promote close economic cooperation between the two countries and to eliminate possible barriers to trade caused by overlapping taxing jurisdictions of the two countries. It is intended to enable the countries to cooperate in preventing avoidance and evasion of taxes.

II. BACKGROUND

The proposed treaty with Spain and the proposed protocol were both signed on February 22, 1990. There is presently no income tax treaty in force between the United States and Spain.

The proposed treaty was transmitted to the Senate for advice and consent to its ratification on April 18, 1990. The proposed

treaty was the subject of a hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations on June 14, 1990.

III. Summary

The proposed treaty is similar to other recent U.S. income tax treaties, the 1981 proposed U.S. model income tax treaty ("U.S. model"), and the model income tax treaty of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development ("OECD Model"). However, there are certain deviations from those documents.

As in other U.S. tax treaties, the objectives of the treaty are principally achieved by each country agreeing to limit, in certain specified situations, its right to tax income derived from its territory by residents of the other country. For example, the proposed treaty provides that a country will not tax business income derived from sources within that country by residents of the other country unless the business activities in the first country are substantial enough to constitute a permanent establishment or fixed base (Articles 7 and 15). Similarly, the proposed treaty contains "commercial visitor" exemptions under which residents of one country performing personal services in the other country are not required to pay tax in that other country unless their contact with that country exceeds specified minimums (Articles 15, 16, and 19). The proposed treaty provides that dividends, interest, royalties, and certain capital gains derived by a resident of either country from sources within the other country generally are taxable by both countries (Articles 10, 11, 12 and 13). Generally, however, dividends, interest, and royalties received by a resident of one country from sources within the other country are to be taxed by the source country on a restricted basis (Articles 10, 11 and 12).

In situations where the country of source retains the right under the proposed treaty to tax income derived by residents of the other country, the treaty generally provides for the relief of the potential double taxation by the country of residence allowing a foreign tax credit (Article 24).

The proposed treaty contains a "saving clause" similar to that contained in other U.S. tax treaties (Article 1(3)). Under this provision, the United States generally retains the right to tax its citizens and residents as if the treaty had not come into effect. In addition, the proposed treaty contains the standard provision that it does not apply to deny a taxpayer any benefits he is entitled to under the domestic law of the country or under any other agreement between the two countries (Article 1(2)); that is, the treaty only applies to the benefit of taxpayers.

The proposed treaty also contains a non-discrimination provision (Article 25) and provides for administrative cooperation and exchange of information between the tax authorities of the two countries to avoid double taxation and to prevent fiscal evasion with respect to income taxes (Articles 26 and 27).

The proposed treaty differs in certain respects from other U.S. income tax treaties, and from the U.S. model and OECD model treaties. Some of these differences are as follows:

(1) The U.S. model specifically does not limit the application of the accumulated earnings tax and the personal holding company

tax. Provision 2 of the proposed protocol provides for only limited exemptions from these taxes. With respect to the personal holding company tax, a Spanish company is granted exemption for a taxable year only if all of its stock is owned for the entire taxable year by one or more individuals who are neither U.S residents nor U.S. citizens. In the case of the accumulated earnings tax, exemption is granted to a Spanish company only if it meets the publicly traded company exception contained in the article on limitation on benefits (Article 17) of the proposed treaty.

(2) The definition of the term "United States" as contained in the proposed treaty generally conforms to the definition provided in the U.S. model. In both treaties the term generally is limited to the United States of America, thus excluding from the definition U.S. possessions and territories. Provision 3 of the proposed protocol, however, explains that the United States and Spain have agreed to initiate, as soon as possible, the negotiation of an additional protocol to extend application of the proposed treaty to Puerto Rico.

In addition, the proposed treaty makes it clear that each country includes its continental shelf, whereas the U.S. model is silent with respect to this point.

(3) U.S. citizens who are not also U.S. residents are not generally covered by the proposed treaty. The U.S. model does cover such U.S. citizens. The United States rarely has been able to negotiate coverage for nonresident citizens, however.

(4) Both the proposed treaty and the U.S. model provide that a person who is taxable under the laws of a country by reason of that person's residence is considered a resident of that country for treaty purposes. Provision 5(a) of the proposed protocol limits the application of this rule in the case of certain persons who are treated as U.S. residents under the Code. That provision states that a U.S. citizen or alien admitted to the United States for permanent residence (i.e., a "green card" holder) is considered a resident of the United States for purposes of the proposed treaty only if that individual either has a substantial presence in the United States or would be a U.S. resident (and not a resident of another country) under the criteria of the tie-breaker rule, which deal with the place of a person's permanent home, center of vital interests, and habitual abode. This provision of the proposed protocol is to be administered in the same order of priority as specified in the tie-breaker rule.

(5) Under the U.S. model, a dual resident corporation is considered a resident of the country under whose laws it was created and is, thus, entitled to only the treaty benefits that other corporate residents of that country receive.[1] Under the proposed treaty, by contrast, the determination of a single country of residence for a company that is a resident of both countries is effected through mutual agreement by the competent authorities of the two countries. The proposed treaty further provides that in situations where the competent authorities are unable to agree upon a determination of a company's country of residence, the company is treated as a resident of neither the United States nor Spain except for the

[1] Under the OECD model a dual resident corporation is considered a resident of the country in which its place of effective management is situated.

limited purpose of taxing payments of dividends, interest, and royalties made by the company. This means, for example, that if a dual resident company pays a dividend to a Spanish resident, the U.S. withholding tax on that dividend is limited by the proposed treaty. Conversely, if that same company paid a dividend to a resident of the United States, the Spanish withholding tax on that dividend likewise is limited by the proposed treaty.

(6) The definition of permanent establishment in the proposed treaty is somewhat broader than that in the U.S. model, the OECD model, and in some existing U.S. treaties. The principal area in which the proposed treaty departs from the U.S. model is the inclusion as a permanent establishment of a drilling rig or ship that is used for more than six months for the exploration or exploitation of natural resources (rather than the U.S. or OECD models' 12 months).

(7) The proposed treaty omits the standard treaty provision found in the U.S. model which provides investors in real property in the country not of their residence with an election to be taxed on such investments on a net basis. The OECD model does not provide for such a net-basis election. Current U.S. law independently provides a net-basis taxation election to foreign persons (Code secs. 871(d) and 882(d)). Based on information provided by the Treasury in its Technical Explanation, the Committee understands that Spain taxes real property income on a net basis if the property is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base and such income is part of the business income of such permanent establishment or fixed base. Otherwise, the income arising from that property is considered passive investment income under Spanish law and is subject to a 25-percent gross basis withholding tax.

(8) The proposed treaty contains a provision not found in the U.S. or OECD models or in most other U.S. treaties that is intended to permit Spain to tax imputed rental income in certain cases where real property owned by a company or other entity is made available to an owner of shares or other rights in that company or entity. For example, where a U.S. person is a shareholder in a Spanish company which owns real property located in Spain, and that U.S. person is permitted use of that property, Spain, in accordance with its domestic law, may tax the imputed rental value of the property either to the company or to the shareholder.

(9) The proposed treaty provides clarification in a number of instances with respect to the ability of a country to tax profits derived by a business enterprise or derived from the performance of independent personal services. Specifically, the proposed treaty states that such profits may, in certain cases, be taxed by a country in which an enterprise carries on *or has carried on* business or where a person performs *or has performed* services. This clarifies that Code section 864(c)(6) is not overridden by the proposed treaty.

(10) The proposed treaty does not contain a definition of the term "business profits," although certain categories of business profits are defined in various articles. Although the OECD model does not contain a definition of business profits, many U.S. treaties, and the U.S. model, define the term business profits to include income from rental of tangible personal property and from rental or licensing of films or tapes. The proposed treaty includes payments for the use

of, or the right to use, these specific items as royalties, which generally are subject to an 8-percent source-country withholding tax imposed on a gross basis.

(11) Similar to the OECD model, the article on associated enterprises (Article 9) of the proposed treaty omits the provision found in the U.S. model treaty and in most other U.S. treaties which clarifies that neither treaty country is precluded from the use of any domestic law which permits the distribution, apportionment, or allocation of income, deductions, credits, or allowances between persons, whether or not residents of one of the treaty countries, owned or controlled directly or indirectly by the same interests, where necessary in order to prevent evasion of taxes or clearly to reflect the income of any of such persons. It is understood by Treasury that the United States is entitled under the proposed treaty to utilize the rules of Code section 482 in cases where it is necessary to reallocate profits among related enterprises to reflect results which would prevail in a transaction between independent enterprises.

(12) The proposed treaty's limits on gross-basis dividend withholding tax rates that the country of source may impose differ from those of the U.S. model. Both treaties provide for two levels of limitation. With respect to the proposed treaty, these levels are, in general: 10 percent in the case of dividends paid to a 25-percent or more corporate owner, and 15 percent in other cases. These limitations contrast with the five percent limit on dividends paid to 10-percent or more corporate owners and the 15-percent limit on other dividends contained in the U.S. model.

(13) Generally, the proposed treaty, the U.S. model, and the OECD model all share a common definition of the term "dividends." [2] The proposed treaty further defines this term, however, to include income from arrangements, including debt obligations, carrying the right to participate in profits, to the extent so characterized under the local law on the country in which the income arises. That is, each country is to apply its domestic law, for example, in differentiating dividends from interest.

Additionally, provision 7(a) of the proposed protocol contains a modification to the definition of dividends. Under that provision, dividends include profits on a liquidation of a company which is a resident of one of the countries. The provision does not specify whether the amount to be treated as a dividend is the amount of earnings and profits of the liquidating corporation, or if it is limited to the amount of gain recognized by the shareholder (or shareholders) as a result of the liquidation. Because a treaty generally is used only to the benefit of a taxpayer, characterization of a liquidating distribution as a dividend would not apply in cases where dividend treatment would yield a greater amount of tax than would the treatment of a liquidation generally prescribed under applicable local law. For example, where a Spanish individual disposes of the stock of a U.S. corporation pursuant to a liquidation of

[2] That definition is "income from shares or other rights, not being debt-claims, participating in profits, as well as income from other corporate rights which is subjected to the same taxation treatment as income from shares by the laws of the State of which the company making the distribution is a resident."

that company, U.S. law generally does not subject the disposition to tax. (However, tax is imposed on such a disposition only in cases where the individual is present in the United States for at least 183 days during the taxable year, where the corporation is a U.S. real property holding corporation, or where the gain resulting from the disposition is effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business.) [3] By contrast, treatment of the gain as a dividend would result in the imposition on the shareholder of either a 10- or 15-percent tax under the proposed treaty; thus, providing a detrimental result to the shareholder.

Finally, the proposed treaty, as amended by provision 7(d) of the proposed protocol, prescribes a maximum withholding rate of 15 percent on dividends if those dividends are paid by a regulated investment company (RIC), regardless of whether the RIC dividends are paid to a direct or portfolio investor. The proposed treaty does not permit a reduction of U.S. withholding tax on dividends if those dividends are paid by a real estate investment trust (REIT), unless the dividends are beneficially owned by an individual holding a less than 25-percent interest in the REIT. The Senate recently gave advice and consent to protocols with France and Belgium on the understanding that provisions be negotiated with those countries permitting withholding rates on RIC and REIT dividends higher than the rates provided for in general by the U.S. treaties with those countries.

(14) The proposed treaty generally limits the rate of withholding tax at source on gross interest to 10 percent. As an exception to this general rule, interest derived by the governments of the countries, derived by financial institutions on certain long-term loans, or paid in connection with the sale on credit of industrial, scientific, or commercial equipment is exempt from source country withholding tax. The OECD model also permits the source country to tax interest as a rate of up to 10 percent. Under the U.S. model, all interest generally is exempt from source country withholding tax.

Because of the repeal in the Tax Reform Act of 1984 (the "1984 Act") of the U.S. gross withholding tax on interest paid on portfolio indebtedness held by foreign persons, Spanish residents generally receive U.S. source interest on portfolio indebtedness free of U.S. tax in any event. U.S. residents, on the other hand, generally are subject to Spanish tax (limited to 10 percent by the treaty) on Spanish source interest on similar indebtedness.

In addition, the proposed treaty permits each country to impose a branch-level interest tax on certain amounts of interest expense deducted by a permanent establishment located in that country of a corporation resident in the other country. The rate of branch-level interest tax that may be imposed by a country is limited by the proposed treaty to 10 percent (5 percent in the case of interest of a bank).

(15) The proposed treaty allows source-country taxation of royalties at rates ranging from 5 to 10 percent. Both the U.S. and OECD

---

[3] In addition, legislation has been introduced in Congress that would tax as effectively connected income gains derived by foreign persons from the disposition of U.S. stock in cases where the foreign person held at least a threshold amount (i.e., 10 percent) of the stock of the U.S. corporation (H.R. 3299, sec. 11404, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. (1989); H.R. 4308, sec. 201, 101st Cong. 2d Sess. (1990); S. 2410, sec. 201, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990)).

models exempt royalties from source-country tax. In addition, the proposed treaty includes in the definition of royalties payments of any kind received in consideration for the use of, or the right to use, industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment. Such payments are not treated as royalties under the U.S. model. Rather, they generally are subject to the provisions of the business profits article of that treaty (Article 7).

(16) Although not found in the OECD model, the U.S. model, or many other U.S. treaties, the proposed treaty contains a special provision for determining the source of royalties. This provision only applies for purposes of determining whether royalties are taxable in the source country; it is not applicable in determining the source of royalties for purposes of computing the foreign tax credit under the article on relief from double taxation (Article 24). The special sourcing provision includes four separate rules. First, if the payor of a royalty is the government of one of the treaty countries (or political subdivision or local authority thereof), then the royalty is sourced in that country. Second, if the royalty is paid by a person, whether or not a resident of one of the two countries, who has a permanent establishment or fixed base in one of the countries in connection with which the liability to pay the royalty arose, and if the royalty is actually borne (i.e., is deducted in computing taxable income) by that permanent establishment or fixed base, then the royalty is sourced in the country in which the permanent establishment or fixed base is located. Third, if a royalty is not borne by a permanent establishment or fixed base located in one of the countries, then it is sourced in the country of the payer's residence (as determined under the proposed treaty). Fourth, where the person paying a royalty neither is a resident of, nor has a permanent establishment or fixed base in, one of the countries, but the royalty relates to the use of (or right to use) property in one of the countries, then the royalty is sourced in the country where such property is used. Similar source rules for royalties are contained in the U.S. treaties with Australia and New Zealand.

By contrast, since the U.S. model does not specifically provide (for any purpose) a sourcing rule for royalties, the applicable rule of domestic law applies. With respect to the domestic law of the United States, royalties generally are sourced in the country where the property giving rise to the royalty is used (Code sec. 861(a)(4)).

(17) In general, the U.S. model, the OECD model, and the proposed treaty all permit the source country to tax gains in the limited situations involving dispositions of either real property interests or personal property associated with a permanent establishment or fixed base. Unlike the model treaties, the proposed treaty extends the right of a source country to tax gains in certain cases where a resident of the other country disposes of stock, participations, or other rights in the capital of a company or other entity that is a resident of the first country. The source country may tax such gains only where the person disposing of the specified asset had a direct or indirect participation of at least 25 percent of the capital of the company or entity during the prior 12-month period. Under present U.S. law, the United States would not subject to tax such a disposition by a Spanish resident of the stock of a U.S. company.

Legislation has been proposed, however, which would require the imposition of such a tax.[4]

(18) The limitation on benefits articles in the U.S. model and in the proposed treaty have certain dissimilarities. The U.S. model generally provides entitlement to treaty benefits only to entities (a) that are more than 75 percent beneficially owned by individual residents of the country of residence of the entity; [5] and (b) that do not use a substantial portion of their income to meet liabilities of persons who are not residents of either treaty country and who are not U.S. citizens (a "base erosion" rule).

In addition, the U.S. model contains two special rules. First, the general rules discussed above do not apply if it is determined that the principal purpose behind the acquisition or maintenance of an entity and the conduct of its operations was not to obtain treaty benefits. Second, the U.S. model specifies that no treaty relief is granted by one country to a resident of the other country to the extent that, under the domestic law of that other country, the income to which the relief relates bears significantly lower tax than similar income arising in the other country derived by its residents. Although the proposed treaty contains a rule that is similar to the first special rule, it does not contain a provision similar to the second special rule.

The proposed treaty enumerates a number of persons that are entitled to treaty benefits. A person not specifically mentioned in this article may not obtain benefits under the treaty unless that person is able to demonstrate to the competent authority of the country in which income arises that the granting of treaty benefits is warranted in that person's particular case.[6] The persons listed in the proposed treaty to whom treaty benefits are extended include (a) individual residents of either treaty country, (b) the government of either country (including political subdivisions or local authorities thereof), (c) certain not-for-profit organizations, (d) other tax-exempt organizations provided that more than half of the beneficiaries, members, or participants in such organizations are entitled to treaty benefits under this article, (e) certain publicly traded companies, and (f) companies that are more than 50 percent beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by persons entitled to treaty benefits or by U.S. citizens, and that meet a base erosion test similar to the one included in the U.S. model.

(19) Like the OECD model, the proposed treaty allows directors' fees derived by a resident of one country for services performed outside of that country in his capacity as a member of the board of directors of a company which is a resident of the other country to be taxed in that other country. The U.S. model treaty, on the other hand, generally treats directors' fees under other applicable articles, such as those on personal service income. Under the U.S.

---

[4] Both H.R. 4308 (sec. 201, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990)) and S. 2410 (sec. 201, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990)) would permit the U.S. to generally impose tax on a disposition of stock of a U.S. corporation by a foreign person who owns 10 percent or more of the stock of that corporation.

[5] A company whose stock is substantially traded on a recognized exchange in one of the treaty countries is presumed owned by individual residents of that country.

[6] In making such a determination, the competent authority is to take into account the factors set forth in the first anti-abuse rule of the U.S. model discussed above (i.e., the purposes behind an entity's acquisition, maintenance, and operations).

model (and the proposed treaty), the country where the recipient resides generally has primary taxing jurisdiction over personal service income.

(20) Under the proposed treaty, a source country may tax income derived by entertainers and athletes from their activities as such, without regard to the existence of a fixed base or other contacts with the source country, if that income exceeds $10,000 in a taxable year. Under the U.S. model treaty, entertainers and athletes are so taxable in the source country only if they earn more than $20,000 there during a taxable year. Most U.S. income tax treaties follow the U.S. model rule, but use a lower annual income threshold. Under the OECD model, entertainers and athletes may be taxed only by the country of source, regardless of the amount of income that they earn from artistic or athletic endeavors.

The proposed treaty also includes an exception from source-country taxation of entertainers and athletes resident in the other country if the visit to the source country is substantially supported by public funds of the country of residence. Neither the U.S. model nor the OECD model contains such an exception.

(21) Under the U.S. model, the United States maintains exclusive rights to tax U.S. social security payments made to residents of the other country or to U.S. citizens. The proposed treaty, by contrast, permits both the U.S. and Spain to tax social security and other public pension payments. In cases where both countries tax such payments, the recipient's country of residence is required under the proposed treaty to allow relief from double taxation for any taxes imposed by the other country.

(22) The U.S. model, the OECD model, and the proposed treaty all provide a general exemption from host-country taxation of certain payments from abroad received by students and trainees who are or were resident of one country and present in the host country. Whereas the U.S. and OECD models permit this exemption without regard to any income threshold or time limit, the proposed treaty allows it only for a period not exceeding five years with respect to students, and only for a period of twelve consecutive months with respect to trainees. The proposed treaty also exempts researchers on the same basis as students, and exempts certain grant receipts from wherever they may arise.

The proposed treaty also permits an exemption from host-country tax for up to fixed amounts of personal services income earned by certain visiting students, researchers, and trainees. Neither the U.S. model nor the OECD model contain such an exemption.

(23) The U.S. model provides certain specific sourcing rules for purposes of computing the foreign tax credit. For example, under the U.S. model, income derived by a resident of one country which is taxable in the other country pursuant to the treaty (other than solely by reason of citizenship) is sourced in that other country. Moreover, income derived by a resident of one of the countries which is not taxable by the other country is sourced in the taxpayer's country of residence.

The proposed treaty only contains two specific sourcing rules applicable to the relief of double taxation. Article 24 of the proposed treaty provides a foreign tax credit source rule which has limited application. Under that rule, in the case of a U.S. citizen who is a

resident of Spain whose income is taxable by the United States by reason of that person's citizenship (i.e., income that is taxed by the United States under the saving clause), such income is deemed to arise in Spain to the extent necessary to avoid double taxation. Article 13 of the proposed treaty contains a foreign tax credit source rule that is applicable when one country (the "source country") imposes tax on a resident of the other country's gain from the disposition of stock, participations, or other rights in the capital of a company or other legal person that is a resident of the source country. Under this rule, the gain is deemed to arise in the source country where necessary to avoid double taxation of the gain. In cases other than those specified above, the source rules of applicable domestic law shall apply.

(24) Under the proposed treaty's mutual agreement procedure rules, a case must be presented for consideration to a competent authority within five years from the first notification of the action resulting in taxation not in accordance with the provisions of the proposed treaty. The U.S. model does not specify any time limit for presentation of a case to a competent authority, whereas the OECD model provides a three-year time limit for this purpose.

(25) The proposed treaty's exchange of information provision contains some differences from the U.S. model. The U.S. model provides for the exchange of information relating to taxes of every kind imposed by the two countries. The proposed treaty provides for the exchange of information only with respect to taxes generally covered by the treaty (under Article 2). Also, the U.S. model requires that, where specifically requested by the competent authority of one country, the competent authority of the other country provide requested information in the form requested. The proposed treaty does not include a similar requirement.

(26) Unlike either the U.S. or OECD model treaties, the proposed treaty, as amended by provision 10(b) of the proposed protocol, permits a country to tax, in accordance with its internal law, gains from the alienation of (i.e., removal of) personal property which are attributable to a permanent establishment that an enterprise of the other country has or had in the first country. Tax may be imposed by that country, however, only on the amount of the gain that has accrued at the time of the property's removal from that country. Moreover, the proposed treaty provides that gain may be taxed in the other country, in accordance with its law, but only to the extent of the gain accruing subsequent to the time of removal from the first country. The Committee understands that this provision represents a compromise between the Spanish custom of taxing accrued, but unrealized gains at the time the asset is removed from Spain, with the U.S. rules under Code section 864(c)(7), which generally permits the United States to tax the realization of gains from the disposition of property that formerly was part of a U.S. business. This rule of the proposed treaty is subject to the saving clause.

(27) The U.S. model provides rules regarding tax collection assistance to be provided to one treaty country by the other treaty country. Specifically, the U.S. model provision states that each treaty country shall endeavor to collect on behalf of the other treaty country such amounts as may be necessary to ensure that treaty-

relief granted from taxation generally imposed by that other country does not inure to the benefit of persons not entitled thereto. Neither the proposed treaty nor the OECD model contain similar clauses.

IV. Date of Entry Into Force and Termination

ENTRY INTO FORCE

In general, the proposed treaty will enter into force when the instruments of ratification are exchanged. With respect to taxes on dividends, interest, and royalties, the treaty will be effective for amounts paid or credited on or after the first day of the second month next following the date on which the treaty enters into force. With respect to other taxes, the treaty is to be effective for taxable periods beginning on or after January 1 of the year following the date on which the treaty enters into force.

The proposed protocol provides that the competent authorities of the two countries are to consult together regarding the appropriateness of negotiating any modification of the proposed treaty to reflect subsequent substantial changes in the domestic legislation of either country or in their tax relations with third countries.

TERMINATION

The proposed treaty will continue in force indefinitely, but either country may terminate it at any time after five years from its entry into force. Notice of termination must be made through diplomatic channels, and given at least six months before the end of a calendar year.

If termination occurs, it will be effective for taxes chargeable for any taxable year beginning on or after the first day of January in the calendar year next following the year in which notice is given.

V. Committee Action

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the proposed Spanish income tax treaty and protocol, and on other proposed treaties, on June 14, 1990. The hearing was chaired by Senator Sarbanes. The Committee considered the proposed treaty on June 28, 1990, and ordered it favorably reported by a voice vote with the recommendation that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the proposed treaty and protocol.

VI. Committee Comments

The Committee on Foreign Relations approved the proposed treaty and protocol. On balance, the Committee believes that this treaty is in the interest of the United States and urges that the Senate act promptly to give advice and consent to ratification. However, the Committee has taken note of certain issues raised by the proposed treaty, and believes that the following comments may be useful to U.S. Treasury officials in providing guidance on these matters should they arise the course of future treaty negotiations.

(1) Treaty shopping

The proposed treaty, like a number of U.S. income tax treaties, generally limits treaty benefits for treaty country residents so that only those residents with a sufficient nexus to a treaty country will receive treaty benefits. Although the proposed treaty is intended to benefit residents of Spain and the United States only, residents of third countries sometimes attempt to use a treaty to obtain treaty benefits. This is known as treaty shopping. Investors from countries that do not have tax treaties with the United States, or from countries that have not agreed in their tax treaties with the United States to limit source-country taxation to the same extent that it is limited in another treaty may, for example, attempt to secure a lower rate of U.S. tax on interest by lending money to a U.S. person indirectly through a country whose treaty with the United States provides for a lower rate. The third-country investor may do this by establishing a subsidiary, trust, or other investing entity in that treaty country, which then makes the loan to the U.S. person and claims the treaty reduction for the interest it receives.

The anti-treaty shopping provision of the proposed treaty is similar to an anti-treaty shopping provision in the Internal Revenue Code (as interpreted by Treasury regulations) and in several newer treaties. Some aspects of the provisions, however, differ either from the anti-treaty shopping provision of the U.S. model or from the anti-treaty shopping provisions sought by the United States in some treaty negotiations since the model was published in 1981. The issue is whether the proposed anti-treaty shopping provision of the treaty effectively forestalls potential treaty shopping abuses.

One provision of the anti-treaty shopping article of the proposed treaty is more lenient than the comparable rule in the U.S. model and other U.S. treaties. The U.S. model allows benefits to be denied if 75 percent or less of a resident company's stock is held by individual residents of the company's country of residence, while the proposed treaty (like several newer treaties and an anti-treaty shopping provision in the Code) lowers the qualifying percentage to 50, and broadens the class of qualifying shareholders to include residents of either treaty country, citizens of the United States, and certain other specified persons. Thus, this safe harbor is considerably easier to enter, under the proposed treaty. On the other hand, counting for this purpose shareholders who are residents of either treaty country would not appear to invite the type of abuse at which the provision is aimed; that is, ownership by third-country residents attempting to obtain treaty benefits. In addition, a base erosion test contained in the proposed treaty provides protection from certain potential abuses of a Spanish conduit.

Another item contained in the proposed treaty's anti-treaty shopping rules differs from the U.S. model. This provision permits an entity, not otherwise authorized to obtain treaty benefits, to obtain benefits under the proposed treaty if it can demonstrate to the competent authority of the country in which the income in question arises that such person is deserving of treaty benefits. The proposed treaty states that in making its determination whether or not to extend treaty benefits, the competent authority of the rele-

vant treaty benefits, the competent authority of the relevant country shall take into account, among other things, whether the establishment, acquisition, and maintenance of the entity, and the conduct of its operations, did not have as one of its principal purposes the obtaining of benefits under the proposed treaty. A rule of the U.S. model, on the other hand, provides that treaty benefits *shall not be limited* if it is determined that the acquisition or maintenance of the entity and the conduct of its operations did not have as a principal purpose the purpose of obtaining treaty benefits. Although both provisions contain a principal purpose test, it appears that the provision of the proposed treaty grants the relevant competent authority greater opportunity to refuse treaty benefits since the principal purpose behind the establishment, acquisition, or maintenance of the entity and the conduct of its operations is just one of the factors to be taken into consideration.

The Committee believes that the United States should maintain its policy of limiting treaty shopping opportunities whenever possible. The Committee is particularly concerned that in applying the treaty, Treasury seek to ensure that the rules as applied adequately deter treaty shopping abuses. The proposed anti-treaty shopping provision may be effective in preventing third-country investors from obtaining treaty benefits by establishing investing entities in Spain; for example those investors may be unwilling to share ownership of such investing entities on an equal basis with U.S. or Spanish residents or other qualified owners in order to meet the ownership test of the anti-treaty shopping provision. On the other hand, the Committee is aware that implementation of the tests for treaty shopping set forth in the treaty may raise factual, administrative, or other issues that cannot currently be foreseen. The Committee emphasizes that the anti-treaty shopping rules of the proposed treaty must be implemented so as to serve as an adequate tool for preventing possible treaty-shopping abuses in the future.

(2) Treatment of construction projects and drilling rigs as permanent establishments

The proposed treaty contains a permanent establishment article that is broader than that contained in the U.S. or OECD model. This article permits the country in which the activities are carried on to tax the activities sooner than it would be able to under either model treaty. Under the proposed treaty, U.S. enterprises carrying on activities in connection with a building site, construction or installation project, or an installation or drilling rig used for exploration for and exploitation of natural resources may be subject to Spanish tax if they are present in Spanish territory for as little as six months in any twelve-month period. This treatment contrasts with the general twelve-month permanent establishment rules of the U.S. and OECD models. The practical effect of this provision could be to increase Spanish taxation of construction and mineral exploration activities. On the other hand, this rule also permits increased U.S. taxation of domestic construction and mineral exploration activities conducted by Spanish residents.

The Committee expects that the Treasury Department will attempt in future treaty negotiations to follow, to the extent possible, the U.S. model provision for the determination of a permanent es-

tablishment in the case of construction and mineral exploration operations.

(3) Treatment of equipment rentals

In addition to containing the traditional definition of royalties which is found in most U.S. tax treaties (including the U.S. model), the proposed treaty provides that royalties include payments for the use of, or the right to use, industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment. These payments are often considered business profits by other treaties, subject to rules which generally permit the source country to tax such profits only if they are attributable to a permanent establishment located in that country. In such case, the tax is computed on a net basis. By contrast, the proposed treaty permits gross-basis source-country taxation of these payments, at a rate not to exceed 10 percent, if the payments are not attributable to a permanent establishment situated in the source country. If the payments are attributable to such a permanent establishment, then the business profits article of the proposed treaty applies and the income is taxed on a net basis in the source country.

The Committee expects that the Treasury Department will attempt in future treaty negotiations to follow, to the extent possible, the U.S. model provision for the source-country taxation of equipment rentals.

(4) Insurance excise tax

The proposed treaty covers (i.e., waives) the U.S. excise tax on insurance premiums paid to foreign insurers. Thus, for example, a Spanish insurer or reinsurer without a permanent establishment in the United States can collect premiums on policies covering a U.S. risk or a U.S. person free of this tax. However, the tax is imposed to the extent that the risk is reinsured by the Spanish insurer or reinsurer with a person not entitled to the benefits of the proposed treaty or another treaty providing exemption from the tax. This latter rule is known as the "anti-conduit" clause.

Although waiver of the excise tax appears in the 1981 U.S. model treaty, waivers of the excise tax have raised serious Committee and other Congressional concerns. For example, concern has been expressed over the possibility that they may place U.S. insurers at a competitive disadvantage to foreign competitors in U.S. markets, if insubstantial tax is imposed by the other country to the treaty (or any other country) on the insurance income of its residents (or the income of companies with which they reinsure their risks). Moreover, in such a case waiver of the tax does not serve the purpose of treaties to avoid double taxation, but instead has the undesirable effect of eliminating all taxation.

The U.S.-Barbados and U.S.-Bermuda tax treaties each contained such a waiver as originally signed. In its report on the Bermuda treaty, the Committee expressed the view that those waivers should not have been included. The Committee stated that waivers should not be given by Treasury in its future treaty negotiations without prior consultations with the appropriate committees of Congress. Congress subsequently enacted legislation to ensure the sunset of the waivers in the two treaties. The waiver of the tax in the treaty with the United Kingdom (where the tax was waived

without the so-called anti-conduit clause) has been followed by a number of legislative efforts to redress perceived competitive imbalance created by the waiver.

The proposed treaty waives imposition of the excise tax on premiums paid to residents of Spain. The Committee understands that unlike Bermuda and Barbados, Spain imposes substantial tax on income, including insurance income, of its residents. Moreover, Spanish internal law imposes a similar tax on insurance and reinsurance premiums derived in Spain by foreign companies. This tax is reciprocally waived in the proposed treaty with respect to U.S. insurers. Unlike the U.K. waiver, moreover, the waiver in the proposed treaty contains the standard anti-conduit language. On balance, and giving due consideration to the information provided by the Treasury Department with respect to this issue, the Committee believes that the practical effect of the waiver of the tax in this treaty is in fact to reduce double taxation, rather than to give Spanish insurers competing in the U.S. market a significantly more favorable overall tax burden than their U.S. counterparts.

(5) U.S. taxation of stock gains of certain foreign persons

The United States does not currently impose tax on U.S. source noneffectively connected capital gains of nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations, with primarily two exceptions: (1) gains realized by a nonresident alien who is present in the United States for at least 183 days during the taxable year, and (2) certain gains from the sale of interests in U.S. real estate. The proposed treaty provides that gains of Spanish residents are exempt from U.S. tax unless they are (1) gains from the disposition of U.S. real property interests; (2) gains from the alienation of personal property which forms or formed part of the business property of a permanent establishment or a fixed base in the United States; (3) gains from the alienation of a right or property which are contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition thereof; or (4) gains from the disposition of stock of a U.S. corporation if the recipient of the gain was at least a 25-percent owner of that corporation within the 12-month period immediately preceding the disposition. Thus, if a Spanish person without a U.S. permanent establishment or fixed base owns less than 25 percent of the stock in a U.S. corporation, any gains from the disposition of that stock generally will be exempt from U.S. tax under the treaty, regardless whether U.S. internal law is changed to provide for such a tax, unless that change was specifically intended to override existing treaties.

In 1989, the House of Representatives passed a bill that would have taxed the gain on a disposition by a foreign person of stock in a U.S. corporation if the foreign person holds or held more than 10 percent of the stock of the U.S. corporation at any time during the 5 years prior to the disposition.[7] This provision, had it been enacted into law, would have yielded to contrary existing treaties for a 3-year period and then overridden them subsequently. In the committee report on this provision, however, it was anticipated that in some cases, it could have been desirable for the United

[7] H.R. 3299, sec. 11404, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. (1989). The provision was deleted in conference.

States to enter into treaties that would modify the effect of the provision on treaty country residents.

The override provision was considered by the Administration to be a serious defect in the bill, putting aside the more basic tax policy question whether such gains of foreign persons should be exempt in all cases from U.S. tax, when dividends paid by U.S. corporations to foreign corporations are not, or whether it would not be more appropriate to tax gains no more favorably than dividends.

Bills have been introduced this year in both Houses of Congress that would tax as effectively connected income gains derived by foreign persons from the sale of stock of domestic corporations in cases where the foreign person holds or held at least 10 percent of the stock of the domestic corporation.[8] Unlike the unsuccessful House bill provision of 1989, the 1990 bills generally do not override existing contrary treaties.

Thus, if the 1990 bill were enacted, the proposed treaty would prevent the operation of U.S. law that would otherwise tax U.S. stock gains derived by a Spanish person who owned between 10 and 25 percent of the U.S. company's stock during the prior 12-month period, or owned less than 10 percent during that period, but owned at least 10 percent at any time during the four years preceding that period.

As a general matter, the Committee is concerned about recommending consent to ratification of a treaty that would limit the operation of a tax that the Congress may decide to impose as the result of a change in its internal tax law policy. Although prior Congresses may have believed that the gains realized by foreign persons from the disposition of stock in U.S. companies were properly excluded, as a statutory matter, from the U.S. tax base, whether for reasons of administrability or for other reasons, Congress may decide that it is no longer appropriate to do so in the case of substantial foreign shareholders in U.S. stock. The Congress could further decide that, just as it is inappropriate in treaties to reduce source country taxation of dividends to zero, it is similarly inappropriate to reduce to zero the rate of tax on gains from stock that pays such dividends, or that it is inappropriate to reduce such tax to zero in all cases and for all types of dispositions.

Alternatively, the Congress could decide that, while a tax on stock gains should be imposed by statute, it may properly be modified in some treaties.[9]

The Committee does not believe that its general concern about entering into treaties in conflict with pending tax policy changes necessitates a reservation to this treaty. In the Committee's view, even if Congress were to enact a tax on foreigners' stock gains, a moderate restriction on operation of the statute, such as the one contained in the proposed treaty, may not be inappropriate.

---

[8] H.R. 4308, sec. 201, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990); S. 2410, sec. 201, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990).

[9] "The committee anticipates that in some cases it may be desirable for the United States to enter into treaties that would modify the effect of the provision on treaty country residents. For example, in a case where the treaty country imposes a similar tax subject to a 25-percent threshold rather than a 10-percent threshold, the committee anticipates that it may be appropriate for the United States to enter into a treaty exempting those treaty country residents who are not at least 25-percent shareholders in a domestic corporation, assuming as well that the persons obtaining relief under such a treaty are subject to tax that would be imposed by the bill." H.R. Rep. No. 101-247, 101st Cong., 1st Sess. 1314 (1989).

(6) Exchange of information

The exchange of information article contained in the proposed treaty is very similar to the corresponding article of the OECD model treaty. The exchange of information article of the U.S. model differs in some respects from the corresponding article in the OECD model (and in the proposed treaty). For example, the U.S. model contains a provision, not found in the language of the OECD model or in the proposed treaty, that places a requirement on the competent authority of a treaty country to obtain the information requested by the other competent authority "in the same manner and to the same extent" as if the tax of the requesting country was its own tax and was being imposed by it. Such a provision is intended to establish a reciprocal commitment on behalf of each treaty country to make available to the other country its investigative authority and procedures as mandated under its domestic law in order to obtain the information sought by the other country. Provision 19(a) of the proposed protocol, however, provides that the exchange of information article of the proposed treaty is to be interpreted consistently with the Commentary on Article 26 of the 1977 OECD model convention. That commentary, in part, provides that although a treaty country is not bound to go beyond its own internal laws and administrative practice in putting information at the disposal of the other country, types of administrative measures that are authorized for that country's tax must be utilized, even though invoked solely to provide information to the other treaty country. The OECD commentary also states that information is deemed to be obtainable in the normal course of administration if it is in the possession of the tax authorities or can be obtained by them in the normal procedure of tax determination. The Committee understands that the reference to the Commentary on the OECD model treaty is intended to be interpreted as being consistent with the U.S. model provision that requires the competent authority of a treaty country to obtain the information requested by the other competent authority in the same manner and to the same extent as if the tax of the requesting country was its own tax and was being imposed by it.

As an example of another difference between the treaties, the exchange of information provision of the U.S. model further places a requirement on each treaty country, if requested by the other country, to provide information in the form of depositions of witnesses and authenticated copies of unedited original documents, including books, papers, statements, records, accounts, or writings, to the same extent that such depositions and documents are obtainable under its internal laws and administrative practices and procedures with respect to its own taxes. This part of the U.S. model's exchange of information article is intended to assure that evidence can be obtained in a form admissible for purposes of litigation. No such requirement is imposed by the proposed treaty.

A third difference between the U.S. model and the proposed treaty (and OECD model) is that the U.S. model contains a clause that requires each treaty country to assist in the collection of taxes to the extent necessary to ensure that treaty benefits provided by the other country are enjoyed only by persons entitled to those

benefits under the treaty. In providing such assistance, the U.S. model does not impose on the other country an obligation to carry out administrative measures that are at variance with its internal measures for tax collection, or that are contrary to its sovereignty, security, or public policy. Assistance in collection can be useful, for example, in a case where an entity located in a country with which the United States has a treaty serves as a nominee for a third-country resident. If the entity, on behalf of the third-country resident, receives a dividend from a U.S. corporation with respect to which a reduced rate of tax (as provided for by the treaty) is inappropriately withheld, the entity, as a withholding agent, is technically liable to the United States for the underpaid amount of tax. However, without assistance from the government of the treaty country in which the entity is resident, enforcement of that liability may be difficult.

A fourth difference is that the U.S. model's exchange of information provisions are made specifically applicable to taxes of every kind imposed at the national level, notwithstanding the limitations contained in the taxes covered article of the treaty. A provision of this type permits, for example, information exchanges regarding estate taxes even though general application of the treaty does not extend to those taxes. The corresponding provision of the proposed treaty applies only to the taxes specified in the taxes covered article (Article 2).

Although the Committee believes that it would be preferable for the United States to be able to obtain information from Spain in the forms specified in the U.S. model treaty and to utilize the Spanish Government for tax collection assistance purposes, the absence of these provisions in the proposed treaty does not, in the Committee's opinion, warrant a reservation of the proposed treaty. Because the proposed treaty will be interpreted to require Spain to obtain information requested by the United States in the same manner and to the same extent as if the U.S. tax at issue were Spanish tax, some assurance is provided that Spain will take whatever measures are possible under its tax laws to obtain information for the benefit of the United States.

(7) Second-level withholding on dividends

Under current U.S. Code rules, a Spanish corporation engaged in the conduct of a trade or business in the United States would, in the absence of a treaty, be subject to a flat 30-percent branch profits tax on its "dividend equivalent amount." In a case where imposition of the branch profits tax is precluded by treaty, the Code imposes U.S. withholding tax on a portion of the dividends paid by a foreign corporation to a foreign person, if 25 percent or more of the corporation's gross income over a three-year testing period consists of income that is treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business. The U.S. source portion of such dividend generally is equal to the total amount of the dividend, multiplied by the ratio over the testing period of the foreign corporation's U.S. effectively connected gross income to total gross income. This so-called second-level withholding tax is only imposed in the absence of a branch profits tax because both taxes accomplish a similar objective: ensuring that, like the U.S earnings of U.S. cor-

porations, the U.S. earnings of foreign corporations are subject to both corporate and shareholder level U.S. tax.

The proposed treaty expressly permits the United States to impose the branch profits tax on a Spanish corporation, and expressly forbids imposition of the second-level withholding tax on a dividend paid by a Spanish corporation to a Spanish resident. The proposed treaty also expressly forbids imposition of the second-level withholding tax on a dividend paid by a third-country corporation to a Spanish resident.

The Committee is concerned that this favorable treatment of dividends paid by non-Spanish corporations under the Spanish treaty may not be appropriate. Corporations resident in many other countries with which the United States has treaties currently are not subject to the branch tax. This is not the preferred U.S. treaty position, and the Treasury Department is in at least some cases negotiating to permit the imposition of the branch tax on residents of these companies. At present, however, the Committee understands that most U.S. treaties, as interpreted by the Treasury Department, do not permit imposition of the branch profits tax.

In light of the number of countries which have U.S. tax treaties protecting residents from the U.S. branch tax, and in light of the purposes of the second-level withholding tax, it seems to the Committee that it would be appropriate that a dividend paid by a corporation that is resident in neither Spain nor the United States, to a resident of Spain, be subject to possible U.S. withholding tax if the corporation is not subject to the U.S. branch tax due to a treaty. Yet under the proposed treaty, for example, a Dutch company doing business in the United States can pay dividends to a Spanish resident who has no U.S. permanent establishment or fixed base without incurring U.S. branch tax or U.S. dividend withholding tax.

The proposed treaty can be said to be flawed insofar as it treats such a dividend no differently than it treats a dividend paid by a Spanish corporation, which is subject to the U.S. branch tax. The Committee believes that it may be preferable for future treaties with branch tax provisions like those in the proposed treaty to eliminate U.S. second-level withholding taxes on dividends only in cases of dividends paid by companies resident of the other country.

VII. Budget Impact

The Committee has been informed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation that the proposed treaty is estimated to have a minimal negative effect on annual budget receipts.

VIII. Explanation of Treaty Provisions

A detailed, article-by-article explanation of the proposed income tax treaty between the United States and Spain (as modified by the proposed protocol) appears below.

ARTICLE 1. GENERAL SCOPE

The general scope article describes the persons who may claim the benefits of the proposed treaty and contains other rules, includ-

ing the "saving clause" that generally allows each country to tax its citizens and residents notwithstanding the proposed treaty.

The proposed treaty applies generally to residents of the United States and to residents of Spain, with specific exceptions designated in other articles. This follows other U.S. income tax treaties, the U.S. model income tax treaty, and the OECD model income tax treaty. Residence is defined in Article 4.

The proposed treaty also contains the rule found in other U.S. tax treaties that its provisions will not restrict in any manner any exclusion, exemption, deduction, credit, or other allowance otherwise accorded by the domestic laws of either country or any other agreement between the two countries. Thus, the proposed treaty applies only where it benefits taxpayers. In cases where a treaty provision would have a detrimental effect on a taxpayer, the taxpayer may elect to utilize the rules of domestic law or of another agreement between the two countries. However, the Committee understands that the benefit of Code and treaty provisions cannot be chosen in an inconsistent manner. For example, the permanent establishment threshold for source-country taxation of business profits (Article 7) applies to all business activities conducted in a source country or to no such business activities; the taxpayer may not selectively apply the treaty's permanent establishment threshold to income-generating business activities but apply the lower statutory threshold to loss-generating activities (Rev. Rul. 84-17, 1984-1 C.B. 308). Similarly, the Committee understands that when the application of any provision of law takes into account tax attributes of more than one year (e.g., loss carryovers or foreign tax credit carryovers), either statutory rules or treaty rules must be consistently applied to all of the tax attributes involved.

Like all U.S. income tax treaties, the proposed treaty is subject to a "saving clause." Under this clause, with specific exceptions described below, the proposed treaty is not to restrict the taxation by either country of its residents (as defined by the treaty) or its citizens. By reason of this saving clause, unless otherwise specifically provided in the proposed treaty, the United States will continue to tax its citizens who are residents of Spain as if the treaty were not in force. "Residents" for purposes of the treaty (and thus, for purposes of the saving clause) include corporations and other entities as well as individuals (Article 4 (Residence)). Because Article 4 generally provides for the determination of a single residence country for persons covered by the proposed treaty, the saving clause has two effects. First, it preserves the right of a country to tax its residents (as determined under the treaty) in situations where exclusive taxing jurisdiction is granted (except for this clause) to the other state. Second, it preserves the right of a country to tax its citizens in situations where the citizen is treated as a resident of the other country pursuant to the proposed treaty, and exclusive taxing jurisdiction is granted (except for this clause) to the country of residence. In cases where a country applies the saving clause to tax its residents or citizens, a credit generally is allowed for taxes paid to the other country pursuant to the article providing relief from double taxation (Article 24).

Under Code section 877 ("Expatriation to avoid tax"), a former U.S. citizen whose loss of citizenship had as one of its principal

purposes the avoidance of U.S. income, estate or gift taxes is, with respect to certain income, subject to U.S. tax for a period of 10 years following the loss of citizenship. The proposed treaty (as amended by the first provision of the proposed protocol) contains the standard provision found in the U.S. model and most recent treaties specifically retaining the right to tax former citizens. Even absent a specific provision the Internal Revenue Service has taken the position that the United States retains the right to tax former citizens resident in the other treaty country (Rev. Rul. 79-152, 1979-1 C.B. 237). In accordance with the proposed protocol, the competent authorities of the two countries are to consult as to whether a principal purpose of a person's loss of citizenship was the avoidance of U.S. tax.

The proposed treaty provides exceptions to the saving clause for certain benefits conferred by the articles dealing with associated enterprises (Article 9); child support (Article 20); relief from double taxation (Article 24); non-discrimination (Article 25); and mutual agreement procedures (Article 26). These exceptions are consistent with those in the U.S. model.

In addition, the saving clause does not apply to the benefits conferred by one of the countries under the articles dealing with government service (Article 21), students and trainees (Article 22), and diplomatic agents and consular officers (Article 28), to individuals who are not citizens of the conferring country and do not have "immigrant status" in the conferring country. This exclusion is standard, and is included in the U.S. model. For U.S. purposes, an individual has immigrant status in the United States if he has been admitted to the United States as a permanent resident under U.S. immigration laws (i.e., holds a "green card").

ARTICLE 2. TAXES COVERED

United States

In general

In the case of the United States, the proposed treaty applies to the Federal income taxes imposed by the Internal Revenue Code (but excluding social security contributions). According to provision 2(a) of the proposed protocol, however, a Spanish company shall be exempt from the U.S. personal holding company tax in any taxable year only if all of its stock is owned for the entire year by one or more individuals who are not residents or citizens of the United States. In addition, provision 2(b) of the proposed protocol provides that a Spanish company shall be exempt from the accumulated earnings tax in any taxable year only if it is a company that meets the requirements of paragraph 1(f) of the article on limitation on benefits (Article 17).

The proposed treaty also applies to the excise tax with respect to private foundations. In addition, subject to an "anti-conduit rule," the proposed treaty applies to the U.S. excise tax imposed on insurance premiums paid to foreign insurers.

Tax on insurance premiums

Code rules.—Under the Code, the United States imposes an excise tax on certain insurance premiums received by a foreign insurer from insuring a U.S. risk or a U.S. person (Code secs. 4371-4374). Unless waived by treaty, the excise tax applies to those premiums which are exempt from U.S. net basis income tax. Under the Code (in the absence of a contrary treaty provision), a foreign insurer is subject to U.S. net basis income tax on income in situations where that insurance income is effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business. However, a foreign insurer insuring U.S. risks ordinarily will not be viewed as conducting a U.S. trade or business, and thus will not be subject to U.S. income tax, if it has no U.S. office or agent and operates in the United States solely through independent brokers. In these situations, the insurance excise tax is imposed (except as otherwise provided in a treaty) on the premiums paid for that insurance.[10]

The excise tax may be viewed as serving the same function as the tax imposed on dividends, interest, and other types of passive income paid to foreign investors. In general, the excise tax applies to insurance covering risks wholly or partly within the United States where the insured is (1) a U.S. person or (2) a foreign person engaged in a trade or business in the United States. Under the Code, the excise tax generally applies to a premium on any such insurance unless the amount is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States and not exempt by treaty from the statutory net-basis tax.

The treatment of insurance income of foreign insurers is complicated somewhat in situations where, as is usually the case, some portion of the risk is reinsured with other insurers in order to spread the risk. In situations where the foreign insurer is engaged in a U.S. trade or business and thus subject to the U.S. income tax, reinsurance premiums, whether paid to a U.S. or a foreign reinsurer, are allowed as deductions. Accordingly, the foreign insurer is taxable only on the income attributable to the portion of the risk it retains. However, while no excise tax generally is imposed on the insurance policy issued by the foreign insurer doing business in the United States, the one-percent excise tax on reinsurance is imposed if and when that insurer reinsures that U.S. risk with a foreign insurer not subject to U.S. net-basis income tax.

Proposed treaty.—The insurance excise tax described above is covered by the proposed treaty, but only to the extent that the foreign insurer does not reinsure the risks in question with a person not entitled to relief from this tax under the proposed treaty or another U.S. treaty.

More specifically, income of a Spanish insurer from the insurance of U.S. risks or U.S. persons will not be subject to the insurance excise tax (except in situations where the risk is reinsured with a company not entitled to the exemption). This waiver applies even if that insurance income is not attributable to a U.S. permanent establishment maintained by the Spanish insurer and hence

[10] The excise tax is currently imposed at a rate of four percent of the premiums paid on casualty insurance and indemnity bonds, and one percent of the premiums paid on life, sickness, and accident insurance, annuity contracts, and reinsurance (Code secs. 4371-4374).

not subject to U.S. net basis tax pursuant to the articles on business profits (Article 7) and other income (Article 21). This treatment is similar to that provided in some other recent U.S. tax treaties, for example, the treaties with France and Hungary, and the pending treaties with Finland, India, and Germany. The excise tax on premiums paid to foreign insurers is a covered tax under the U.S. model treaty.

In exempting from the U.S. income tax and the insurance excise tax all insurance income which is not attributable to a permanent establishment in the United States, the proposed treaty makes two changes in the statutory rules governing the taxation of insurance income of Spanish insurers. First, any insurance income which is effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business but is not attributable to a U.S. permanent establishment will not be subject to U.S. income tax. Those Spanish insurers which continue to maintain a U.S. permanent establishment after the proposed treaty enters into force will remain subject to the U.S. income tax on their net U.S. insurance income attributable to the permanent establishment.

Second, Spanish insurers not engaged in a U.S. trade or business generally will no longer be subject to the insurance excise tax. The insurance excise tax will continue to apply, however, in situations where a Spanish insurer with no U.S. trade or business reinsures a policy it has written on a U.S. risk with a foreign reinsurer, other than a resident of Spain or another insurer entitled to exemption under a different tax treaty (such as the U.S.-France treaty). The tax liability may be imposed on the Spanish insurer which in this situation is viewed as the U.S. resident person transferring the premium to the foreign reinsurer. The excise tax will apply to such reinsurance even where the Spanish insurance company has a U.S. trade or business, but no U.S. permanent establishment, and thus will not be subject to U.S. *income* tax on the net income it derives on the portion of the risk it retains.

For example, assume a Spanish company not engaged in a U.S. trade or business insures a U.S. casualty risk and receives a premium of $200. The company reinsures part of the risk with a Danish insurance company (not currently entitled to exemption from the excise tax) and pays that Danish company a premium of $100. The four-percent excise tax on casualty insurance applies to the premium paid to the Spanish insurance company to the extent of the $100 reinsurance premium. Thus, the U.S. insured is liable for an excise tax of $4, which is four percent of the portion of its premium paid to the Spanish insurer which was used by the Spanish insurer to reinsure the risk. It is the responsibility of the U.S. insured to determine to what extent, if any, the risk is to be reinsured with a nonexempt person. Under an administrative procedure currently in effect, the burden of this responsibility effectively can be shared with the Spanish insurer (*see* Rev. Proc. 87-13, 1987-1 C.B. 596).

Spain

In the case of Spain, the proposed treaty applies to the income tax on individuals (el impuesto sobre la renta de las personas fisicas) and the corporation tax (el impuesto sobre sociedades). The cor-

poration tax includes the tax imposed by Spain on insurance and reinsurance premiums earned in Spain by foreign persons.

The proposed treaty also contains a provision generally found in U.S. income tax treaties to the effect that it will apply to identical or substantially similar taxes that either country may subsequently impose. The proposed treaty, like the U.S. model, obligates the competent authority of each country to notify the competent authority of the other country of any significant changes in the tax laws of its country and of any published material concerning application of the treaty.

ARTICLE 3. GENERAL DEFINITIONS

The proposed treaty contains certain of the standard definitions found in most U.S. income tax treaties.

The term "Spain" means the Spanish State; when used geographically, it includes the territory of Spain and any area beyond Spanish territorial waters in which, by Spanish legislation and in accordance with international law, Spain may exercise jurisdiction or sovereign rights with respect to the seabed, its subsoil, and superjacent waters and their natural resources. Therefore, income earned on the Spanish continental shelf is covered.

The "United States" means the United States of America, a term that does not include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam or any other United States possession or territory.[11] The definition of the United States also includes, when the term is used in a geographical sense, the territorial waters of the United States and any area beyond the territorial waters in which, in accordance with international law and the laws of the United States, the United States may exercise jurisdiction or sovereign rights with respect to the seabed, its subsoil, and superjacent waters, and their natural resources. The intent of this rule is to cover the U.S. continental shelf in conformity with the definition of continental shelf contained in section 638 of the Code.

The term "a Contracting State" or "the other Contracting State" means Spain or the United States, as the context requires.

The term "person" is defined to include an individual, a company and any other body of persons. A "company" is any body corporate or any entity which is treated as a body corporate for tax purposes. Provision 4 or the proposed protocol clarifies that the term "any other body of persons" specifically includes estates, trusts, and partnerships. Furthermore, according to the Treasury Department's Technical Explanation of the proposed treaty, it is understood that this term includes any other persons, as defined under domestic law, which may be subject to tax (e.g., foundations, cooperatives, associations, and other similar groups of individuals and companies).

An "enterprise of a Contracting State" is defined as an enterprise carried on by a resident of that country. Although the treaty does not define the term "enterprise," it would have the same meaning that it has in other U.S. tax treaties; that is, the trade or

---

[11] Pursuant to provision 3 of the proposed protocol, Spain and the United States have agreed to initiate the negotiation of a Protocol to extend the application of the proposed treaty to Puerto Rico, taking into account the special features of the taxes applied by Puerto Rico.

business activities undertaken by an individual, partnership, company, or other entity.

The proposed treaty defines the term "nationals" to mean individuals possessing nationality of the relevant country, and legal persons, associations, or other entities deriving their status from the law in force in the United States or Spain. Under this definition, for example, a corporation organized under the law of one of the 50 states or the District of Columbia is a U.S. national. One result of this broad definition is a broad application of the non-discrimination rules (Article 25).

The proposed treaty defines "international traffic" as any transport by a ship or aircraft by an enterprise of one of the two countries, except where the transport is solely between places in the other country (i.e., wholly within the other country). Accordingly, with respect to a Spanish enterprise, purely domestic transport in the United States is not international traffic.

The U.S. competent authority is the Secretary of Treasury or his authorized representative. The U.S. competent authority function has been delegated to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has redelegated the authority to the Assistant Commissioner (International) of the IRS. On interpretive issues, the latter acts with the concurrence of the Associate Chief Counsel (International) of the IRS.

The Spanish competent authority is the Minister of Economy and Finance or his authorized representative.

The proposed treaty also contains the standard provision that, unless the context otherwise requires or the competent authorities of the two countries establish a common meaning, all terms not otherwise defined by the proposed treaty are to have the meaning which they have under the applicable tax laws of the country applying the proposed treaty.

ARTICLE 4. RESIDENCE

The assignment of a country of residence is important because the benefits of the proposed treaty generally are available only to a resident of one of the countries as that term is defined in the treaty. Furthermore, double taxation is often avoided by the proposed treaty assigning one of the countries as the country of residence where under the laws of the countries the person is a resident of both.

Under U.S. law, residence of an individual is important because a resident alien is taxed on his worldwide income, while a nonresident alien is taxed only on U.S. source income and on his income that is effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business. A company is a resident of the United States if it is organized in the United States. Under the standards for determining residence provided in the 1984 Act, an individual who spends substantial time in the United States in any year or over a three-year period generally is a U.S. resident. A permanent resident for immigration purposes (i.e., a "green card" holder) also is a U.S. resident. The standards for determining residence provided in the 1984 Act do not alone determine the residence of a U.S. citizen for the purpose of any U.S.

tax treaty (such as a treaty that benefits residents, rather than citizens, of the United States).

The proposed treaty generally defines "resident of a Contracting State" to mean any person who, under the laws of that State, is subject to tax therein by reason of his domicile, residence, place of management, place of incorporation, or any other criterion of a similar nature.[12] The term "resident of a Contracting State" does not include, however, any person who is subject to tax in that country in respect only of income from sources in that country.

This provision of the proposed treaty generally is based on the fiscal domicile article of the U.S. model and OECD model tax treaties and is similar to the provisions found in other U.S. tax treaties. Consistent with most U.S. income tax treaties, a U.S. citizen is not considered a U.S. resident unless the individual has a substantial presence in the United States or would be a resident only of the United States based on his or her permanent home, center of vital interests, or habitual abode in the United States (provisions 5(a) of the proposed protocol). As a result, U.S. citizens residing overseas (in countries other than Spain) generally are not entitled to the benefits of the proposed treaty as U.S. residents. This result is contrary to U.S. treaty policy as expressed in the U.S. model, although the U.S. policy is achieved in few treaties. In addition, provision 5(a) of the proposed protocol extends this limitation to U.S. green card holders.

Moreover, in the case of income derived or paid by a partnership, an estate, or trust, provision 5(b) of the proposed protocol provides that the term "resident of a Contracting State" applies only to the extent that the income derived by the partnership, estate, or trust is subject to tax in that country as the income of a resident, either in its hands or in the hands of its partners or beneficiaries. For example, if the share of U.S. residents in the profits of a U.S. partnership is only one-half, Spain would have to reduce its withholding tax on only half of the Spanish source income paid to the partnership.

Under provision 5(c) of the proposed protocol, the definition of the term "resident" is extended to include a Contracting State or a political subdivision or a local authority thereof.

The proposed treaty provides a set of "tie-breaker" rules to determine residence in the case of an individual who, under the basic treaty definition, is considered a resident of both countries. Such a dual resident individual is deemed a resident of the country in which he has a permanent home available to him. If this permanent home test is inconclusive because the individual has a permanent home in both countries, the individual's residence is deemed to be the country with which his personal and economic relations are closer, i.e., his "center of vital interests". If the country in which he has his center of vital interests cannot be determined, or if he does not have a permanent home available to him in either country, he is deemed to be a resident of the country in which he

[12] According to the Treasury Department's Technical Explanation, a person's status as a resident will not be denied simply because the income of that person is exempt from tax in a country. This would apply, for example, in the case of a pension fund which generally is exempt from U.S. income tax under the Code.

has an habitual abode. If the individual has an habitual abode in both countries or in neither of them, he is deemed to be a resident of the country of which he is a national as defined in the article setting forth general definitions (Article 3). If he is a national of both countries or of neither of them, the competent authorities of the countries shall settle the question of residence by mutual agreement.

In the case of a person other than an individual that is resident in both countries under the general definition, the proposed treaty requires the competent authorities of the two countries to endeavor to settle the question by mutual agreement and to determine how the proposed treaty applies to that person. If the competent authorities are unable to make a determination of residence, the person is not treated as a resident of either country except that it is treated as a resident of both countries for purposes of payments made by such person covered by the articles on dividends (Article 10), interest (Article 11), and royalties (Article 12). This means, for example, that if a dual resident company pays a dividend to a Spanish resident, the U.S. withholding tax on that dividend is limited by the proposed treaty. Conversely, if that same company paid a dividend to a resident of the United States, the Spanish withholding tax on that dividend likewise is limited by the proposed treaty.

ARTICLE 5. PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT

The proposed treaty contains a definition of the term "permanent establishment" which, with certain exceptions, follows the pattern of other recent U.S. income tax treaties, the U.S. model, and the OECD model.

The permanent establishment concept is one of the basic devices used in income tax treaties to limit the taxing jurisdiction of the host country and thus mitigate double taxation. Generally, an enterprise that is a resident of one country is not taxable by the other country on its business profits unless those profits are attributable to a permanent establishment of the resident in the other country. In addition, the reduced rates of, or certain exemptions from, tax provided for dividends, interest, and royalties will apply unless the income is attributable to the permanent establishment, in which case such items of income are taxed as business profits. U.S. taxation of business profits is discussed under Article 7 (Business Profits).

In general, under the proposed treaty, a permanent establishment is a fixed place of business through which an enterprise engages in business in the other country. A permanent establishment includes a place of management, a branch, an office, a factory, a workshop, and a mine, an oil or gas well, a quarry, or other place of extraction of natural resources. It also includes any building site or construction or installation project, or an installation or drilling rig or ship used for the exploration or exploitation of natural resources, if the activity lasts for more than 6 months. Where activities are carried on by an enterprise that is associated with another enterprise as defined in the proposed treaty (Article 9), the two enterprises are deemed to be a single enterprise for purposes of determining whether the 6-month test has been satisfied if the activities

of both enterprises are substantially the same, unless they are carried on simultaneously. The proposed treaty's 6-month period is significantly shorter than the 12-month period required in the U.S. model treaty in determining whether similar activities constitute a permanent establishment.

The general rule is modified to provide that a fixed place of business that is used solely for specified activities will not constitute a permanent establishment. These activities include the use of facilities solely for storing, displaying, or delivering goods or merchandise belonging to the enterprise or the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the enterprise solely for storage, display, or delivery, or solely for processing by another enterprise. These activities also include the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for the purchase of goods or merchandise or for the collection of information, or solely for the purpose of carrying on, for the enterprise, any other activity of a preparatory or auxiliary character. In addition, these activities include the maintenance of a fixed place of business solely for any combination of the activities mentioned in this paragraph as long as the overall activity of the fixed place of business resulting from these activities is of a preparatory or auxiliary character.

If a person has, and habitually exercises in a treaty country, the authority to conclude contracts in a country on behalf of an enterprise of the other country, then the enterprise generally is deemed to have a permanent establishment in the first country. This rule does not apply where the person's activities are limited to the activities specified in the previous paragraph which would not constitute a permanent establishment if carried on by the enterprise through a fixed place or business located in the first country (e.g., the purchase of goods, the collection of information, and any other activity of a preparatory or auxiliary nature). The proposed treaty contains the usual provision that the agency rule will not apply to create a permanent establishment if the agent is a broker, general commission agent, or other agent of independent status acting in the ordinary course of its business.

The determination whether a company of one country has a permanent establishment in the other country is made without regard to the fact that the company is related to a company that is a resident of the other country or to a company that engages in business in that other country. The relationship is thus not relevant; only the activities of the company being tested and its agents are relevant.

ARTICLE 6. INCOME FROM REAL PROPERTY (IMMOVABLE PROPERTY)

This article covers income derived from the ownership of real (immovable) property. The rules governing income from the sale of real property are set forth in Article 13.

Under the proposed treaty, income derived by a resident of one country from real property situated in the other country is taxable in the country where the real property is located. Income from real property includes income from agriculture or forestry.

The term "real property" has the meaning which it has under the law of the country in which the property in question is situat-

ed. The term in any case includes property accessory to real property, livestock and equipment used in agriculture and forestry, the right to which the provisions of general law respecting landed property apply, usufruct of real property and rights to variable or fixed payments as consideration for the working of, or the right to work, mineral deposits, sources and other natural resources. Thus, income from real property will include royalties and other payments in respect of the exploitation of natural resources (e.g., oil). Ships, aircraft and containers used in international traffic are not real property.

The source country may tax income derived from the direct use, letting, or use in any other form of real property. These rules allowing source-country taxation also apply to the income from real property of an enterprise and to income from real property used for the performance of independent personal services.

Where ownership or participation rights in a company or other entity include a right to enjoy real property situated in one of the countries, the income, whether actual or imputed, from that property right is taxable in that country. The Committee understands that this provision was added to the proposed treaty to permit Spain to tax imputed rental income in certain cases where real property held by a company or other entity is made available to the owner of shares or other rights in such company or entity. This rule might apply, for example, where a U.S. corporation owns a Spanish resort property and grants to its shareholders time-share rights to that property. In such a case, Spain may tax the imputed rental income attributable to that property either to the company or to the shareholders in accordance with its domestic law.

Certain U.S. treaties and the current U.S. model treaty permit residents of one country to elect to be taxed on income from real property in the other country on a net basis. The proposed treaty does not contain an election, but such an election is provided for U.S. real property income under the Code (secs. 871(d) and 882(d)). In addition, based on information provided by the Treasury Department in its Technical Explanation, the Committee understands that Spain taxes income from real property on a net basis if such property is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base and such income is part of the business income of the permanent establishment or fixed base. In cases where a permanent establishment or fixed base does not exist in Spain, the passive income arising from the property generally is subject to a 25-percent gross-basis tax, collected through withholding.

Under the article on capital gains (Article 13), gains from the alienation of real property are also taxable by the country where the property is located. In addition, gains from the alienation of shares of certain corporations owning real property situated in a treaty country (e.g., stock in U.S. real property holding companies) are taxable in that country.

ARTICLE 7. BUSINESS PROFITS

United States Code rules

U.S. law distinguishes between the business income and the investment income of a nonresident alien or foreign corporation. A

nonresident alien or foreign corporation is subject to a flat 30-percent rate (or lower treaty rate) of tax on certain U.S. source income if that income is not effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States. The regular individual or corporate tax rates apply to income (from any source) that is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States.

The taxation of income as business or investment income varies depending upon whether the income is U.S. or foreign. In general, U.S. source periodic income (such as interest, dividends, rents, and wages), and U.S. source capital gains are effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States only if the asset generating the income is used in or held for use in the conduct of the trade or business, or if the activities of the trade or business were a material factor in the realization of the income. All other U.S. source income of a person engaged in a trade or business in the United States is treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States (thus, it is said to be taxed as if it were business income under a limited "force of attraction" rule).

In the case of foreign persons other than insurance companies, foreign source income is effectively connected income only if the foreign person has an office or other fixed place of business in the United States and the income is attributable to that place of business. For such persons, only three types of foreign source income can be effectively connected income: rents and royalties on intangible property derived from the active conduct of a licensing business; dividends or interest derived in the active conduct of a banking, financing or similar business in the United States, (or received by a corporation the principal business of which is trading in stocks or securities for its own account); and certain sales income attributable to a U.S. sales office.

The foreign source income of a foreign corporation that is subject to tax under the insurance company provisions of the Code may be treated as U.S.-effectively connected without regard to the foregoing rules, so long as such income is attributable to the U.S. business of the foreign corporation. In addition, the net investment income of such a company which must be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of an insurance business within the United States is not less than an amount based on a combination of asset/liability ratios and rates of return on investments experienced by the foreign person in its worldwide operations and by the U.S. insurance industry.

Trading in stocks, securities, or commodities in the United States for one's own account generally does not constitute a trade or business in the United States, and accordingly, income from those activities is not taxed by the United States as business income. Thus, income from trading through a U.S. based employee, a resident broker, commission agent, custodian, or other agent, or from trading by a foreign person physically present in the United States generally is not taxed as business income. However, this rule does not apply to a dealer or to a corporation the principal business of which is trading in stocks or securities for its own account.

The Code, as amended by the 1986 Act provides that any income or gain of a foreign person for any taxable year which is attributable to a transaction in any other taxable year will be treated as effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business if it would have been so treated had it been taken into account in that other taxable year (Code sec. 864(c)(6)). In addition, the Code provides that if any property ceases to be used or held for use in connection with the conduct of a trade or business within the United States, the determination of whether any income or gain attributable to a sale or exchange of that property occurring within 10 years after the cessation of business is effectively connected with the conduct of trade or business within the United States shall be made as if the sale or exchange occurred immediately before the cessation of business (Code sec. 864(c)(7)).

Proposed treaty rules

Under the proposed treaty, business profits of an enterprise of one country are taxable in the other country only if the enterprise carries on or has carried on business through a permanent establishment situated in the other country, and only to the extent that the business profits are attributable to that permanent establishment. This is one of the basic limitations on a country's right to tax income of a resident of the other country.

The taxation of business profits under the proposed treaty differs from internal U.S. rules for taxing business profits primarily by requiring more than merely being engaged in trade or business before a country can tax business profits and by substituting the "attributable to" standard for the Code's "effectively connected" standard. Under the Code, on the one hand, all that is necessary for effectively connected business profits to be taxed is that a trade or business be carried on in the United States. Under the proposed treaty, on the other hand, some level of fixed place of business must be present and the business profits must be attributable to that fixed place of business.

The proposed treaty differs from the model treaties in permitting a country to tax profits if the other-country resident carries "or carried" on business in that country. Addition of the words "or carried" clarifies that, for purposes of the treaty rules stated above, any income, gain, or expense attributable to a permanent establishment (or fixed base) during its existence is taxable or deductible in the country where the permanent establishment (or fixed base) is situated even if the payments are deferred until after the permanent establishment (or fixed base) has ceased to exist.

The business profits of a permanent establishment are determined on an arm's-length basis. Thus, there is to be attributed to a permanent establishment the business profits which might be expected to have been derived by it if it were a distinct and independent entity engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment, or with any other associated enterprise. For example, this arm's-length rule applies to transactions between the permanent establishment and a branch of the resident enterprise located in a third country. Amounts may

be attributed whether they are from sources within or without the country in which the permanent establishment is located.

In computing taxable business profits, deductions generally are allowed under paragraph 3 of Article 7 for expenses, wherever incurred, that are incurred for the purposes of the permanent establishment. These deductions include a reasonable allocation of executive and general administrative expenses, research and development expenses, interest, and other similar expenses. Thus, for example, a U.S. company which has a branch office in Spain but which has its head office in the United States is, in computing the Spanish tax liability of the branch, entitled to deduct the executive and general administrative expenses incurred in the United States by the head office that are reasonably connected with the profits of the Spanish branch.

Unlike some U.S. treaties and the U.S. model, the proposed treaty does not define the term "business profits." Thus, to the extent not dealt with in other Articles, the term is defined under the laws of the two countries.

Business profits are not attributed to a permanent establishment merely by reason of the purchase of merchandise by a permanent establishment for the account of the enterprise. Thus, where a permanent establishment purchases goods for its head office, the business profits attributed to the permanent establishment with respect to its other activities are not increased by a profit element in its purchasing activities.

The amount of profits attributable to a permanent establishment shall include only the profits or losses derived from the assets or activities of the permanent establishment, and must be determined by the same method each year unless there is good and sufficient reason to change the method.

Where business profits include items of income which are dealt with separately in other articles of the proposed treaty, those other articles, and not the Business Profits Article, will govern the treatment of those items of income. Thus, for example, film rentals are taxed under the provisions of Article 12 (Royalties), and not as business profits, except as provided in paragraph 4 of Article 12.

ARTICLE 8. SHIPPING AND AIR TRANSPORT

As a general rule, the United States taxes the U.S. source income of a foreign person from the operation of ships or aircraft to or from the United States. An exemption from U.S. tax is provided if the income is earned by a corporation that is organized in, or an alien individual who is resident in, a foreign country that grants an equivalent exemption to U.S. corporations and residents. The United States has entered into agreements with a number of countries providing such reciprocal exemptions.

The proposed treaty provides that profits which are derived by an enterprise of one country from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic ("shipping profits") are exempt from tax by the other country, regardless of the existence of a permanent establishment in the other country. International traffic means any transportation by ship or aircraft, except where the transportation is solely between places in the other country (Article 3(1)(h) (Gener-

al Definitions)). The exemption also applies to income derived from the operation of ships and aircraft in international traffic through participation in a pool, a joint business, or an international operating agency. This article on shipping and air transport is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (paragraph 3 of Article 1). Thus, the United States generally may tax the income from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic derived by its citizens and residents, notwithstanding the provisions of this article.

Pursuant to provision 6 of the proposed protocol, the term "income from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic" is defined in accordance with paragraphs 5 through 12 of the Commentary on Article 8 (Shipping, Inland Waterways Transport, and Air Transport) of the OECD model treaty. Thus, for example, profits obtained from the leasing of a fully equipped ship or aircraft are treated as profits from the operation of such a ship or aircraft in international traffic. On the other hand, Article 8 does not apply to profits generated from the leasing of ships or aircraft on a bareboat charter basis, except when such leasing provides an occasional source of income to an enterprise engaged in the international operation of ships or aircraft (paragraph 5 of the Commentary on Article 8 of the OECD model).

Profits generated from activities auxiliary to shipping and air transport enterprises are also subject to the provisions of Article 8 of the proposed treaty. Such auxiliary activities may include, for example, the sale of passage tickets on behalf of other enterprises, the operation of a bus service connecting a town with its airport, advertising and commercial propaganda, and transportation of goods by truck connecting a depot with a port or airport (paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Commentary on Article 8 of the OECD model). In addition, if an enterprise engaged in international transport undertakes to see to it that, in connection with such transport, goods are delivered directly to the consignee in the other country (either by the enterprise or with the use of an unrelated carrier), the profits attributable to transport between places in the other country are considered profits from the operation of ships or aircraft in international traffic (paragraph 9 of the Commentary on Article 8 of the OECD model). The reason for this result is that the profits are not solely attributable to transport between two places in the other country, but rather are in connection with or incidental to international transport.

Profits derived by an enterprise engaged in international transport from the use, maintenance, or lease of containers, and related equipment for the transport of containers, which are supplementary or incidental to its international operation of ships or aircraft fall within the scope of Article 8 (paragraph 10 of the Commentary on Article 8 of the OECD model). Provision 9 of the proposed protocol limits taxation of such income to the country in which the recipient is a resident.

ARTICLE 9. ASSOCIATED ENTERPRISES

The proposed treaty, like most other U.S. tax treaties, contains an arm's-length pricing provision similar to Code section 482. Under this provision of the proposed treaty, each country may

make an allocation of income to that country in the case of transactions between related enterprises, if an allocation is necessary to reflect the conditions and arrangements which would have been made between independent enterprises. It is understood by Treasury that this provision does not limit the United States' right to apply Code section 482 to residents of either treaty country or to the residents of third countries. Thus, the absence from this article of paragraph 3 of the corresponding article of the U.S. model does not imply that the rule embodied in the latter is in any way inconsistent with, or different from, the rule embodied in Article 9 of the proposed treaty.

For purposes of the proposed treaty an enterprise of one country is related to an enterprise of the other country if one of the enterprises participates directly or indirectly in the management, control or capital of the other enterprise. The enterprises are also related if the same persons participate directly or indirectly in the management, control, or capital of both enterprises.

When a redetermination of tax liability has been made by one country in accordance with this provision of the treaty, the other country shall make an appropriate adjustment to the amount of tax paid in that country on the redetermined income. In determining this adjustment, due regard is to be given to the other provisions of the proposed treaty and protocol and, if necessary, the competent authorities of the two countries shall consult with one another. To avoid double taxation, the proposed treaty's saving clause retaining full taxing jurisdiction in the country of residence or citizenship will not apply in the case of such adjustments.

ARTICLE 10. DIVIDENDS

The United States imposes a 30-percent withholding tax on the gross amount of U.S. source dividends (other than dividends paid by an "80/20 company" described in Code section 861(c)) paid to nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations. The 30-percent tax does not apply if the foreign recipient is engaged in a trade or business in the United States and the dividends are effectively connected with that trade or business. In such a case, the foreign recipient is subject to U.S. tax like a U.S. person at the standard graduated rates on a net basis.

U.S. source dividends for purposes of the 30-percent tax are dividends paid by a U.S. corporation (other than a corporation which has in effect an election under Code sec. 936). Also treated as U.S. source dividends for this purpose are certain dividends paid by a foreign corporation if at least 25 percent of the gross income of the foreign corporation, in the prior three year period, was effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business of that foreign corporation.

Under the proposed treaty, dividends paid by a company that is a resident of one country to a resident of the other country are taxable by both countries. The proposed treaty limits, however, the rate of tax that the country of which the payor is a resident may impose on dividends paid to a beneficial owner in the other country. (None of the limitations on taxation of dividends apply to taxation of the company in respect of the profits out of which the dividends are paid.) The limitation is 15 percent or 10 percent, depend-

ing on the relationship between the payor and the payee. With one exception discussed below, the rate of source-country tax can never exceed 15 percent of the gross amount of the dividends. The 10-percent rate of source-country tax applies to dividends if the beneficial owner is a company which owns at least 25 percent of the voting stock of the company paying the dividends. The 15-percent rate applies to dividends in all other cases.

The proposed treaty defines dividends to mean income from shares or other rights (not being debt-claims) participating in profits, as well as income from other corporate rights which is subject to the same tax treatment as income from shares by the laws of the country of which the company making the distribution is a resident. The term dividends, under the proposed treaty, also includes income from arrangements, including debt obligations, carrying the right to participate in profits, to the extent so characterized under the domestic law of the country in which the income arises. This definition of dividend allows the United States to apply its domestic rules for determining whether an interest is debt or equity. Moreover, provision 7(a) of the proposed protocol provides the understanding that the term dividends includes profits on a liquidation of a company which is resident of one of the countries.

The reduced rates of tax on dividends apply unless the beneficial owner of the dividends carries on or has carried on business through a permanent establishment (or fixed base in the case of an individual performing independent personal services) in the source country and the dividends are attributable to the permanent establishment (or fixed base). Dividends attributable to a permanent establishment are taxed on a net basis as business profits (Article 7). Dividends attributable to a fixed base are taxed on a net basis as income from the performance of independent personal services (Article 15).

One country may tax dividends paid by a company not resident in that country, only in two cases: first, where its own resident receives the dividends; and second, where the dividends are attributable to a permanent establishment or a fixed base in that country.

Provisions 7(b) through (d) of the proposed protocol in certain cases permit imposition of the 15-percent tax rate on dividends paid to companies regardless of their level of ownership, and permit full operation of internal law on dividends paid to certain investors by U.S. real estate investment trusts (REITs). First, the 15-percent rate applies to income, whether distributed or not, attributable to shareholders of the Spanish corporations and entities referred to in Article 12.2 of Law 44/1978 of September 8, 1978 and Article 19 of Law 61/1978 of December 27, 1978 or successor statutes, if such income is exempt from Spanish corporation tax. Based on the Treasury's Technical Explanation, the Committee understands that the entities specified above are similar to REITs and regulated investment companies (RICs) in the United States in that only a shareholder level tax is collected on income earned by such entities. Second, 15-percent tax is permitted to be imposed on all dividends paid by a Spanish investment institution which is subject to tax in Spain according to Article 34 or 35 of Law 46 of December 26, 1984 or successor statutes. Third, 15-percent tax is permitted to be imposed on all dividends paid by a U.S. RIC. Fourth, in the case

of dividends paid by a U.S. REIT, the 15-percent rate applies if the beneficial owner of the dividends is an individual holding a less than 25-percent interest in the REIT. Otherwise, the rate of withholding applicable under domestic law (currently 30 percent) may be applied, rather than any reduced rate prescribed by the treaty.

The article on dividends is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on dividend income without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. Specifically, in the case of dividends paid by a U.S. company to a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the U.S. tax is not limited by the source country withholding limits contained in Article 10.

ARTICLE 11. INTEREST

Subject to numerous exceptions (such as those for portfolio interest, bank deposit interest, and short-term original issue discount), the United States imposes a 30-percent tax on U.S. source interest paid to foreign persons under the same rules that apply to dividends. U.S. source interest, for this purpose, generally is interest on debt obligations of a U.S. person, other than a U.S. person that meets the foreign business requirements of Code section 861(c) (e.g., an "80/20" company).

Also subject to the 30-percent tax is interest paid by the U.S. trade or business of a foreign corporation. A foreign corporation is also subject to a branch-level interest tax on "excess interest." For this purpose, "excess interest" means the interest deducted by the foreign corporation in computing its U.S. effectively connected income, to the extent that the deduction exceeds the interest paid by the U.S. trade or business. The branch-level tax on excess interest is an amount equal to the tax the foreign corporation would have paid had a wholly owned domestic corporation paid it an amount of interest equal to the amount of "excess interest."

Under the proposed treaty, interest is taxable by a country if the beneficial owner of the interest is a resident of that country, the interest arose in that country, or the interest is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base in that country. The proposed treaty generally limits the withholding tax imposed at source on interest paid to a beneficial owner who is a resident of the other country to 10 percent. The U.S. model treaty provides for elimination of the withholding tax on interest (i.e., a zero rate), although this result is often not achieved.

Certain exceptions apply to the general rule that permits the source country to tax interest. Interest is exempt from tax by the source country under the proposed treaty if the interest is beneficially owned by the other country, its political subdivision or local authority, or, if agreed upon by the competent authorities of the two countries, any instrumentality of that other country. Also, interest on loans with maturities of five or more years granted by banks or other financial institutions which are residents of one of the countries is subject to tax only in that country. Interest paid in connection with the sale on credit of any industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment is taxable under the proposed treaty only in

the country in which the beneficial owner of the interest is a resident.

The reduced rate established by the proposed treaty applies only if the interest is beneficially owned by a resident of the other country. Accordingly, it does not apply if the recipient is a nominee for a nonresident. Article 17 of the proposed treaty provides additional rules designed to prevent treaty shopping.

The reduced tax rate will not apply if the recipient carries on or has carried on business through a permanent establishment or performs or has performed services from a fixed base in the source country and the interest is attributable to that permanent establishment or fixed base. In that event, the interest is taxed as business profits (Article 7) or income from the performance of independent personal services (Article 15).

The proposed treaty defines interest to mean income from debt-claims of every kind, whether or not secured by mortgage and, subject to the definition of the term "dividends" provided the article on dividends (Article 10, paragraph 3), whether or not carrying a right to participate in the debtor's profits, and all income treated as interest by the tax law of the source country. Thus, the United States can apply its domestic rules for determining whether an interest is debt or equity. The proposed treaty specifies that income from government securities, and income from bonds or debentures, including premiums or prizes attaching to such securities, bonds or debentures constitute interest. Conversely, penalty charges for late payment are not treated as interest under the proposed treaty.

Provision 8 of the proposed protocol sets forth the understanding that income derived from financial assets covered by Spanish Law 14 of May 25, 1985 or successor statutes is considered interest for purposes of the proposed treaty. However, when that income is subject to a special withholding tax at the time of issue of the financial asset, the limitation on the rate of source-country tax does not apply. The Committee understands that Law 14 permits Spain to impose a 55-percent withholding tax on the equivalent of original issue discount at the time of issue of certain bearer bonds, in lieu of taxing bond payments as they mature.

The proposed treaty provides a source rule for interest (which is not relevant to Article 24 (Relief from Double Taxation) for foreign tax credit purposes). Interest is sourced within a country if the payor is the government of that country, including political subdivisions and local authorities, or a resident of that country. If, however, the interest expense is borne by (i.e., for purposes of computing taxable income, deductible by) a permanent establishment (or fixed base) that the payor has in Spain or the United States and the indebtedness was incurred with respect to that permanent establishment (or fixed base), interest has its source in that country, regardless of the residence of the payor. Generally, this is consistent with U.S. source rules (secs. 861–862) which provide as a general rule that interest income is sourced in the country in which the payor is resident. Thus, for example, if a Swiss resident has a permanent establishment in Spain and the Swiss resident incurs indebtedness to a U.S. person for the Spanish permanent establishment, and the permanent establishment bears the interest, then the interest will have its source in Spain.

The proposed treaty addresses the issue of interest charges not at arm's length between parties having a direct or indirect special relationship by providing that the amount of interest for purposes of the treaty is the amount of arm's-length interest. The amount of interest in excess of the arm's-length interest is taxable according to the laws of each country, taking into account the other provisions of this treaty (e.g., excess interest paid to a shareholder may be treated as a dividend under local law and thus entitled to the benefits of Article 10 of the proposed treaty).

The article on interest is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on interest income without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty.

ARTICLE 12. ROYALTIES

Under the same system that applies to dividends and some interest, the United States imposes a 30-percent tax on U.S. source royalties paid to foreign persons. Royalties are from U.S. sources if they are for the use of property located in the United States. U.S. source royalties include royalties for the use of or the right to use intangibles in the United States. Such royalties include motion picture royalties.

The U.S. model treaty exempts royalties from tax at source. The proposed treaty, by contrast, allows limited source-basis taxation of royalties. Generally, royalties from sources (under the royalty source rule discussed below) in one country that are beneficially owned by a resident of the other country are taxable by both countries. As an exception to this general rule, provision 9(a) of the proposed protocol provides that royalties received in consideration for the use of, or for the right to use, containers (and related equipment) in international traffic, are taxable only by the country in which the recipient is a resident.

The source-country tax rate limitation is 5 percent, 8 percent, or 10 percent, depending on the type of property whose use the royalty allows. If a payment of any kind is received as consideration for the use of (or the right to use) any copyright of literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work, the source-country tax rate cannot exceed 5 percent of the gross amount of the royalty. If a royalty payment is received in consideration for the use of (or the right to use) cinematographic films, or films, tapes, or other means of transmission or reproduction of image or sound, the source-country tax rate cannot exceed 8 percent of the gross amount of the royalty. The 8-percent rate also applies with respect to royalties received for the use of, or the right to use, industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment (except for containers used in international traffic as discussed above), or for any copyright of scientific work. (For purposes of this provision, paragraph 9(b) of the proposed protocol states that the determination of whether a payment is in consideration for a copyright for a scientific work is based on the applicable domestic law of the country in which the royalty arises.) In all other cases of royalty payments, the source-country tax rate cannot exceed 10 percent of the gross amount of the royalties. Royalties received as consideration for technical assistance are taxable under

the proposed treaty at the rate applying to the royalties stipulated in respect of the rights or property to which the technical assistance is related. That is, the proposed treaty does not attempt to distinguish between payments made for, or the withholding rate on, a patented process, and those made for a technician, supplied by the patent holder, to monitor that process. For this specific purpose, the taxable base is computed net of labor and material costs in producing such royalties. The rate limitations in the proposed treaty apply only if the royalty is beneficially owned by a resident of the other country; they do not apply if the recipient is a nominee for a nonresident.

Royalties are defined to mean payments of any kind received in consideration for the use of, or the right to use, any copyright of literary, dramatic, musical, artistic or scientific work, including cinematographic films or films, tapes or other means of image or sound reproduction, any patent, trademark, design or model, plan, secret formula or process, or other like right or property, or for the use of, or the right to use, industrial, commercial, or scientific equipment, or for information concerning industrial, commercial or scientific experience. The definition of the term "royalties" also includes both payments for technical assistance performed in one of the countries by a resident of the other country where such assistance is related to the application of any such right or property, and gains derived from the alienation of such right or property to the extent that such gains are contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition thereof. Similar gains that are not so contingent are subject to the rules of the article on capital gains (Article 13).

The reduced withholding tax rate does not apply where the beneficial owner carries on or has carried on business through a permanent establishment in the source country or performs or has performed personal services in an independent capacity from a fixed base in the source country, and the royalties are attributable to the permanent establishment or fixed base. In that event, the royalties are taxed as business profits (Article 7) or income from the performance of independent personal services (Article 15).

The proposed treaty provides special source rules for royalties. Generally under U.S. tax rules (secs. 861–862), royalty income is sourced where the property or right is being used. Under Spanish rules, royalties generally are sourced according to the residence of the payor. The proposed treaty provides a compromise between these two sourcing rules. As a general rule under the proposed treaty, if the payor of a royalty is the government of one of the countries (or a political subdivision or local authority thereof), the royalty is sourced in that country. If the payor of a royalty (whether or not a resident of one of the countries) has a permanent establishment or fixed base in the United States or Spain in connection with which the liability to pay the royalty was incurred, and if the royalties are borne by the permanent establishment or fixed base, the royalties arise (for purposes of the proposed treaty) in the country in which the permanent establishment or fixed base is situated. In cases where the royalty is not borne by a permanent establishment or fixed base located in one of the countries, the royalty is sourced in the payor's country of residence. Finally, in situations where the payor of a royalty is not a resident of either country and

the royalty is not borne by a permanent establishment or a fixed base located in either country, but the royalty relates to the use of, or the right to use, in one of the countries, property described in the proposed treaty's definition of the term "royalty," the royalty is sourced in that country of use.

The proposed treaty's source rules for royalties detailed above are applicable only for purposes of determining whether royalties are taxable in the country of source under Article 12. These rules do not apply with respect to the determination of source for purposes of the permitting a foreign tax credit under the article for relief from double taxation (Article 24).

The proposed treaty provides that in the case of royalty payments or credits between persons having a special relationship, only that portion of the payment or credit that represents an arm's-length royalty is treated as a royalty under the treaty. Payments in excess of the arm's-length amount are taxable according to the law of each country with due regard being given for the other provisions of the proposed treaty. Thus, for example, an excess amount might be treated as a dividend subject to the taxing limitations of Article 10.

The article on royalties is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on royalty income without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. Specifically, in the case of a royalty from a U.S. company accruing to a beneficial owner who is a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the U.S. tax is not limited by the source country withholding limits contained in Article 12.

ARTICLE 13. CAPITAL GAINS

Generally, gain realized by a nonresident alien or a foreign corporation from the sale of a capital asset is not subject to U.S. tax unless the gain is effectively connected with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business or, in the case of a nonresident alien, he is physically present in the United States for at least 183 days during the taxable year. Under the Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act of 1980 ("FIRPTA"), as amended, however, a nonresident alien or foreign corporation is taxed by the United States on gain from the sale of a U.S. real property interest as if the gain were effectively connected with a trade or business conducted in the United States. "U.S. real property interests" include interests in certain U.S. corporations holding U.S. real property.

Under the proposed treaty, only certain capital gains are taxable in the source country. Gains from the disposition of real property are taxable in the country where the real property is situated. The term "real property" is defined in the article on income from real property (Article 6). In addition, provision 10(a) of the proposed protocol provides that for purposes of the article on capital gains, real property in the United States includes a United States real property interest. Currently the term is defined in Code section 897(c). This definition allows the United States to tax any transaction of a Spanish resident taxable under FIRPTA. Code section 897(i) and the proposed treaty would permit a company resident in Spain

holding a U.S. real property interest to elect to be treated as a U.S. corporation with respect to U.S. taxation of that interest.

In order to grant taxing rights to Spain equivalent to those provided to the United States under the above rules, the proposed treaty permits taxation in Spain of gains from the alienation of stock, participations, or other rights in a company or other legal person the property of which consists, directly or indirectly, mainly of real property situated in Spain. The Treasury Department understands that this condition would be deemed to be met if the company's real property assets are greater than its movable property assets.

Gains from the alienation of personal property which are attributable to a permanent establishment which an enterprise of a country has or had in the other country, or which are attributable to a fixed base which is or was available to a resident of a country in the other country for the purpose of performing independent personal services, and gains from the alienation of such a permanent establishment (alone or with the whole enterprise) or such a fixed base, are taxable in that other country.

Provision 10(b) of the proposed protocol provides that gains from the alienation of personal property which are attributable to a permanent establishment that an enterprise of one country has or had in the other country, which property is removed from the other country, are taxable in that other country in accordance with its domestic law, but only to the extent of the gain that has accrued as of the time of such removal. Such property is also taxable under the proposed protocol by the first country in accordance with its domestic law, but only to the extent of the gain accruing subsequent to the time of such removal. Currently under Spanish law, a tax is levied on the accrued, but unrealized, gain in such cases at the time of removal. Under U.S. law, Code section 864(c)(7) permits taxation of certain gain realized on property previously removed from a U.S. trade or business.

In addition to the rules discussed above, if a resident of one of the countries derives gain from the alienation of stock, participations, or other rights in the capital of a company or other legal person that is a resident of the other country and during the previous 12-month period had, directly or indirectly, a participation of at least 25 percent of the capital of that company or other legal person, such gain is taxable in that other country. This rule represents a significant departure from the U.S. model and the OECD model treaties. Under this rule, for example, Spain is permitted to tax the gain arising from the disposition by a U.S. person of stock in a Spanish company, if that U.S. person owned at least 25 percent of the capital of that company. Under current U.S. law, the United States would not levy a tax on the gain derived by a Spanish person in the reciprocal situation (except in the case of a disposition of stock in a U.S. real property holding corporation). However, legislation has been introduced which would permit the United States to tax similar gains.[13]

---

[13] Sec. 201 of H.R. 4308 (101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990)) and sec. 201 of S. 2410 (101st Cong., 2d Sess. (1990)).

Under the rules of the proposed treaty which permit a country to tax gains from dispositions of domestic stock by substantial shareholders, it is specified that where necessary to avoid double taxation of such a gain, the gain is deemed to arise in that country. Thus, the gain of a U.S. person from the disposition of stock in a Spanish company which is subject to Spanish tax is considered foreign source income under this rule for purposes of determining that person's U.S. foreign tax credit.

Provision 10(c) of the proposed protocol states that for purposes of the above rule, an alienation does not include certain transfers of stock between various members of a controlled group of companies that file a tax return on a consolidated basis. This exception applies to the extent that the consideration received by the transferor consists of participations or other rights in the capital of the transferee or of another company resident in the same country that owns (directly or indirectly) 80 percent or more of the voting rights and value of the transferee, if the following three conditions are met. First, the transferor and transferee must be resident in the same country (either the United States or Spain). Second, the transferor or transferee must own (directly or indirectly) 80 percent or more of the voting rights and value of the other, or a company resident in the same country owns (directly or indirectly through companies resident in the same country) 80 percent or more of the voting rights and value of each of them. Third, for the purpose of determining gain on any subsequent disposition, a carryover basis must be used, increased by any cash or other property paid. If cash or other property is received, the amount of the gain, limited to the amount of such cash or other property received, is taxable by the other country.

Gains from the sale or exchange of ships, aircraft or containers operated or used by an enterprise of one country in international traffic are taxable only by the country of the enterprise's residence. The ships, aircraft, and containers whose disposition is exempt from source country capital gains tax under this provision correspond to the property the profits from which are exempt from source-country tax under the article on shipping and air transport (Article 8).

Income or gains from the alienation of any property other than property discussed above are taxable under the proposed treaty only in the country where the alienator is a resident.

The article on gains is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on gains without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. For example, in the case of a gain from the alienation of ships, aircraft, or containers, recognized by a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the United States is not limited in its ability to tax such gain by the provisions contained in Article 13.

ARTICLE 14. BRANCH TAX

United States Code rules

The Code, as amended by the 1986 Act, imposes branch-level taxes on foreign corporations earning income effectively connected

with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business. The branch profits tax is imposed at a rate of 30 percent on a foreign corporation's dividend equivalent amount. Under the branch tax provisions, no U.S. treaty shall exempt any foreign corporation from the branch profits tax (or reduce the amount thereof) unless the treaty is an income tax treaty and the foreign corporation is a "qualified resident" of the treaty country.

A "qualified resident" is defined as any foreign corporation which is a resident of a treaty country and meets at least one of the following tests. First, any foreign corporation resident in a treaty country is a qualified resident of that country unless 50 percent or more (by value) of the stock of the corporation is owned (directly or indirectly within the meaning of Code section 883(c)(4)) by individuals who are not residents of the treaty country and who are not U.S. citizens or resident aliens, or 50 percent or more of its income is used (directly or indirectly) to meet liabilities to persons who are not residents of the treaty country or the United States (a "base erosion" rule). Second, a foreign corporation resident in a treaty country is a qualified resident if the stock of the corporation is primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in the treaty country, or if the corporation is wholly owned (directly or indirectly) either by another foreign corporation which is organized in the treaty country and the stock of which is so traded or by a domestic corporation whose stock is primarily and regularly traded on an established securities market in the United States. Third, the corporation may receive qualified resident status if it establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it meets such requirements as the Secretary may establish to ensure that individuals who are not residents of the treaty country do not use the treaty in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the rules contained in the Code provisions regarding the branch profits tax.

The Code also imposes a 30-percent tax on any interest paid and on "excess interest" deducted by the U.S. trade or business of a foreign corporation to a foreign person. This tax may be reduced or eliminated by treaty in cases where either the foreign corporation or the recipient of the interest is a qualified resident of a treaty country. The rules for determining whether a person is a qualified resident for this purpose are the same as discussed above for the branch profits tax.

Proposed treaty rules

The proposed treaty explicitly permits the United States to impose a branch profits tax on a company which is resident in Spain. The maximum rate of this tax, however, cannot exceed 10 percent of the dividend equivalent amount of the business profits of the company which are effectively connected (or treated as such) with the conduct of a U.S. trade or business and are either attributable to a permanent establishment in the United States or subject to tax in the United States under the article on income from real property (Article 6) or gains from the disposition of real property situated in the United States (Article 13, paragraph 1). With respect to income from U.S. real property, provision 11(a) of the proposed protocol clarifies that the branch profits tax may be im-

posed only if that income has been subject to U.S. tax on a net basis.

The proposed treaty also permits the United States to levy a branch-level tax on the excess, if any, of interest deductible in computing the profits of the corporation which are either attributable to a permanent establishment in the United States or subject to tax in the United States under Article 6 or paragraph 1 of Article 13 of the proposed treaty, over the interest paid by or from that permanent establishment or trade or business in the United States. As with the branch profits tax, the maximum rate of tax at which the branch-level excess interest tax may be imposed under the proposed treaty is 10 percent. In the case of a bank (including a savings bank ("Cajas de Ahorro"), pursuant to provision 11(b) of the proposed protocol) which is a resident of Spain, this maximum rate is reduced to 5 percent.

The proposed treaty contains a reciprocal rule which permits Spain to levy a branch profits tax of no more than 10 percent on the earnings of a U.S. corporation attributable to a permanent establishment in Spain or from income or gains from real property located in Spain, as well as a 10-percent branch-level interest tax (reduced to 5 percent for U.S. banks) on the excess interest expense of a U.S. corporation allocable to its permanent establishment in Spain. Although Spain has statutory provisions for imposition of a branch tax, it is understood that such provisions are not currently in force, according to the Treasury Department's Technical Explanation.

ARTICLE 15. INDEPENDENT PERSONAL SERVICES

Services income in general

The United States taxes the income of a nonresident alien individual at the regular graduated rates if the income is effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States by the individual. (See discussion of U.S. taxation of business profits under Article 7 (Business Profits).) The performance of personal services within the United States can be a trade or business within the United States (sec. 864(b)).

Under the Code, the income of a nonresident alien individual from the performance of personal services in the United States is excluded from U.S. source income, and therefore is not taxed by the United States, in the absence of a U.S. trade or business, if certain criteria are met. The criteria are: (1) the individual is not in the United States for over 90 days during a taxable year, (2) the compensation does not exceed $3,000, and (3) the services are performed as an employee of or under a contract with a foreign person not engaged in a trade or business in the United States, or they are performed for a foreign office or place of business of a U.S. person.

Independent personal services

The proposed treaty limits the right of a country to tax income from the performance of personal services by a resident of the other country. Under the proposed treaty, income from the performance of independent personal services (i.e., as an independent

contractor) is treated separately from income from the performance of personal services as an employee.

Under the proposed treaty, income derived by an individual resident in one country in respect of professional services or similar activities of an independent character performed in an independent capacity in the other country (the "source country") is exempt from tax in the source country, unless the individual has or had a fixed base regularly available to him in that country for the purpose of performing the services. In such case, the source country may tax only that portion of the individual's income that is attributable to the fixed base.

Independent professional services include especially independent scientific, literary, artistic, educational, and teaching activities, as well as independent services of physicians, lawyers, engineers, architects, dentists, and accountants.

According to provision 12 of the proposed protocol, the term "fixed base" is interpreted in accordance with the Commentary on Article 14 (Independent Personal Services) of the OECD model treaty, and with any guidelines for the application of such Article that are developed in the future. The Commentary clarifies that independent personal services attributable to a fixed base are taxed on a net basis under principles analogous to those applicable to the taxation of business profits under Article 7 of the proposed treaty. In addition, the Commentary states that although it had not been thought appropriate to attempt to define the term "fixed base" in the model treaty itself, the term would cover, for instance, a physician's consulting room or the office of an architect or lawyer (paragraph 4 of the Commentary on Article 14 of the OECD model).

The article on independent personal services is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on income derived from the performance of independent personal services without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. For example, in the case of such income earned by a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the U.S. tax is not limited by the rules contained in Article 15.

ARTICLE 16. DEPENDENT PERSONAL SERVICES

Under the Code, the income of a nonresident alien individual from the performance of personal services in the United States is not taxed if the individual is present in the United States for less than 90 days during a taxable year, the compensation does not exceed $3,000, and the services are performed either as an employee of a foreign person not engaged in a trade or business in the United States or for a foreign permanent establishment of a U.S. person.

Under the proposed treaty, income from services performed as an employee in one country (the source country) by a resident of the other country is taxable only in the country of residence if three requirements are met: (1) the individual is present in the source country for fewer than 184 days during any 12-month period; (2) his or her employer is not a resident of the source country; and (3) the

compensation is not borne by a permanent establishment or fixed base of the employer in the source country.

Compensation derived by an employee in respect of employment as a member of the regular complement (i.e., a member of the permanent crew) of a ship or aircraft operated in international traffic by an enterprise of one of the countries is taxable by the country of that enterprise. Under the U.S. model treaty, by contrast, only the country where the employee resides may tax the income.

This article is modified in some respects for pensions (Article 20) and compensation derived as a government employee (Article 21).

The article on dependent personal services is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on employment income without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. For example, in the case of such income earned by a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the U.S. tax is not limited by the rules contained in Article 16.

ARTICLE 17. LIMITATION ON BENEFITS

The proposed treaty is intended to limit double taxation caused by the interaction of the tax systems of the United States and Spain as they apply to residents of the two countries. At times, however, residents of third countries attempt to use a treaty. Such use is known as "treaty shopping," and refers to the situation where a person who is not a resident of either country seeks to obtain certain benefits under the income tax treaty between the two countries. In certain circumstances, and without appropriate safeguards, the nonresident may be able to secure these benefits by establishing a corporation (or other entity) in one of the countries which, as a resident of that country, is entitled to the benefits of the treaty. Additionally, it may be possible for the third country resident to repatriate funds to that third country from the entity under favorable conditions (i.e., it may be possible to reduce or eliminate taxes on the repatriation) either through relaxed tax provisions in the distributing country or by passing the funds through other treaty countries (essentially, continuing to treaty shop), until the funds can be repatriated under favorable terms.

The proposed treaty contains provisions intended to limit the use of the treaty to bona fide residents of the two countries. This is accomplished by providing that a person who is a resident of one country and derives income from the other country is entitled to relief under the proposed treaty from taxation in the other country generally only if it satisfies any one of the following seven objective tests.

First, status as an individual constitutes a safe harbor. Second, no limitation of benefits will apply to the governments (including political subdivisions and local authorities) of the two countries. Third, non-profit religious, charitable, scientific, literary, educational private organizations, and comparable public institutions resident in a treaty country will receive treaty benefits. Fourth, similar treatment is provided to tax-exempt organizations (other than those detailed in the previous sentence), if more than half of

the beneficiaries, members, or participants, if any, in such an organization are entitled to benefits under the treaty.[14]

Fifth, if the income derived in the other country is derived in connection with, or is incidental to, the active conduct by such person of a trade or business in the country of residence (other than the business of making or managing investments by a person other than a bank or insurance company), then no limitation on treaty benefits shall apply. Under this test, the income does not have to be attributable to a permanent establishment in the country in which the income arises. Rather, it only has to be derived by a resident of one of the countries in connection with, or incidental to, the active conduct of a trade or business in that country.

The sixth test is a public company test. Under this test, a company that has substantial and regular trading in its principal class of stock on a recognized securities exchange (a term defined below) is entitled to the benefits of the treaty regardless of where its actual owners reside. In addition, the public company test is satisfied where more than 50 percent of each class of stock of a company is owned by a resident of the same country in whose principal class of shares there is substantial and regular trading on a recognized securities exchange. The term "recognized stock exchange" means the NASDAQ System owned by the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. in the United States; any stock exchange registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a national securities exchange for the purposes of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; the Spanish stock exchange; and any other stock exchange agreed upon by the competent authorities of the two countries.

The seventh test is based on the ownership of the entity and the absence of "base erosion." Under the ownership test, more than 50 percent of the beneficial interest (in the case of a company, more than 50 percent of the number of shares of each class of shares) in that entity must be owned directly or indirectly by any combination of one or more persons that meet any of the other limitation on benefits tests (other than the active business test) or who are citizens of the United States. In addition, a base erosion test must be satisfied. That is, the gross income of the entity must not be used in substantial part, directly or indirectly, to meet liabilities (including liabilities for interest or royalties) other than to persons that meet any of the other limitation on benefits tests (other than the active business test) or who are U.S. citizens. This provision would, for example, deny the benefits of the reduced U.S. withholding tax rates on dividends, interest or royalties to a Spanish company that is owned by individual residents of a third country.

An alternative is provided to persons that do not satisfy any of the seven tests previously discussed. Under this alternative, a person may demonstrate to the competent authority of the country in which the income arises that such person should be granted the

---

[14] Pursuant to provision 13 of the proposed protocol, the tax-exempt organizations described under the fourth safe harbor test include, but are not limited to, pension funds, pension trusts, private foundations, trade unions, trade associations, and similar organizations. In all cases, a pension fund, pension trust, or similar entity organized for the purposes of providing retirement, disability, or other employment benefits that is organized under the laws of either the United States or Spain is entitled to treaty benefits if the organization which sponsors such fund, trust, or entity is not limited with respect to treaty benefits under this article of the proposed treaty.

benefits of the proposed treaty. According to the proposed treaty, one of the factors that is to be taken into consideration by the competent authorities in such cases is whether the establishment, acquisition, and maintenance of such person and the conduct of its operations did not have as one of its principal purposes the purpose of obtaining benefits under the proposed treaty. The burden of overcoming the treaty shopping rule, as under U.S. tax law generally, is on the taxpayer claiming treaty benefits.

ARTICLE 18. DIRECTORS' FEES

The proposed treaty contains a special rule for directors' fees. If an individual who is a resident of one country serves as a member of the board of directors of a company that is a resident of the other country, the country of the company's residence may tax him or her to the extent that the director's fees and similar payments derived by that person are attributable to services performed outside of the country of the individual's residence. This rule also covers payments for services substantially equivalent to those provided by the board of directors of a company. This rule follows the OECD model, except that under the OECD model, income from services performed as a director in the individual's country of residence for a company that is resident in the other country is taxable by the latter country. There is no corresponding rule in the U.S. model treaty. The U.S. model generally treats directors' fees as personal service income.

ARTICLE 19. ARTISTES AND ATHLETES

The proposed treaty contains an additional set of rules which apply to the taxation of income earned by entertainers (such as theater, motion picture, radio or television "artistes" or musicians) and athletes. These rules apply notwithstanding the other provisions dealing with the taxation of income from personal services (Articles 15 and 16) and are intended, in part, to prevent entertainers and athletes from using the treaty to avoid paying any tax on their income earned in one of the countries.

Under the proposed treaty, one country may tax an entertainer or athlete who is a resident of the other country on the income from his or her personal activities as an entertainer in that country during any year unless the gross receipts that he or she derives from such activities, including reimbursed expenses, does not exceed $10,000 or its equivalent in Spanish pesetas for the taxable year. (The comparable amount in the U.S. model treaty is $20,000.) Thus, if a Spanish entertainer maintains no fixed base in the United States and performs (as an independent contractor) for two days in one taxable year in the United States for total compensation of $10,000, the United States may not tax that income. If, however, that entertainer's total compensation is $11,000, the full $11,000 (less appropriate deductions) is subject to U.S. tax. As in the case of the other provisions dealing with personal services income, this provision does not bar the country of residence from also taxing that income (subject to a foreign tax credit).

Provision 14 of the proposed protocol states that the $10,000 threshold does not preclude the source country from imposing with-

holding taxes on income of artistes and athletes, if such imposition is sanctioned under that country's domestic laws. To the extent that the amount of tax withheld in such a case exceeds the actual amount of tax due, such excess will be refunded to the taxpayer after the close of the taxable year.

In addition, the proposed treaty provides that where income in respect of personal services performed by an entertainer or athlete accrues not to the entertainer or athlete but rather to another person or entity, that income is taxable by the country in which the services are performed in any situation where the entertainer or athlete shares directly or indirectly in the profits of the person or entity receiving the income. (This provision applies notwithstanding Articles 7 and 15.) For this purpose, participation in the profits of the recipient of the income includes (without limitation) the receipt of deferred compensation, bonuses, fees, dividends, partnership distributions, or other distributions. The provision does not apply if it is established that neither the entertainer or athlete, nor related persons, participate directly or indirectly in the profits of the person or entity receiving the income in any manner. This provision is intended to prevent performers and athletes from avoiding tax in the country in which they perform by routing the compensation for their services through a third person such as a personal holding company or trust located in a country that would not tax the income.

Notwithstanding the above provisions, the proposed treaty provides that income derived by a resident of one of the countries as an entertainer or athlete is exempt from tax by the other country if the person's visit to the other country is substantially supported by public funds of his or her country of residence (or of a political subdivision or local authority thereof).

The artistes and athletes article is subject to the provisions of the saving clause (Article 1, paragraph 3). Therefore, as a general rule, the United States may tax its citizens and residents on income earned as an entertainer or athlete without regard to the provisions contained in the proposed treaty. For example, in the case of such income earned by a U.S. citizen resident in Spain, the U.S. tax on that income is not limited by the rules contained in Article 19.

ARTICLE 20. PENSIONS, ANNUITIES, ALIMONY, AND CHILD SUPPORT

Under the proposed treaty, pensions and other similar remuneration derived and beneficially owned by a resident of either country in consideration of past employment are subject to tax only in the recipient's country of residence. (A different rule applies in the case of pensions that are paid to citizens of one country attributable to services performed by the individuals for government entities of the other (Article 21 (Governmental Service)).) The saving clause allows each country to continue to tax its citizens who are residents of the other country on pensions and similar remuneration.

Payments under the Social Security legislation of one country and similar public pension payments made to a resident of the other country or to a U.S. citizen are taxable by the country

making such payments, as well as by the country of residence. According to provision 15 of the proposed protocol, this rule equally applies to pensions paid from publicly administered funds for non-governmental services (such as payments from the Railroad Retirement Accounts in the United States).

The proposed treaty also provides (subject to the saving clause) that annuities are taxed by only the country of residence of the person who beneficially derives them. Annuities are defined as stated sums paid periodically at stated times during a specific time period, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration (other than services rendered).

The proposed treaty provides that alimony paid to a resident of one of the countries is taxable only by that country. The saving clause applies to alimony payments, so that the United States can tax such payments made to U.S. citizens resident in Spain. The proposed treaty defines alimony to mean periodic payments made pursuant to a written separation agreement or decree of divorce, separate maintenance, or compulsory support that are taxable to the recipient under the laws of his or her country of residence.

The proposed treaty provides that child support payments paid by a resident of one of the countries to a resident of the other country are taxable only in the country of the payor's residence. The proposed treaty defines child support to mean periodic payments made pursuant to a written separation agreement or decree of divorce, separate maintenance, or compulsory support for the support of a minor child. The saving clause does not apply to child support payments, so that the United States may not tax such payments made by Spanish residents to U.S. citizens or residents. Similarly, the child support rule in the U.S. model is not subject to the saving clause.

ARTICLE 21. GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The proposed treaty contains the standard provision that generally exempts the wages of employees of one of the countries from tax by the other country.

Under the proposed treaty, remuneration, other than a pension, paid by a country or one of its political subdivisions or local authorities to an individual for services rendered to that country (or subdivision or authority) generally is taxable only in that country. Such remuneration is taxable only in the country of performance (rather than in the payor country), however, if the individual is a resident of the country of performance who either (1) is a citizen of that country or (2) did not become a resident of that country solely for the purpose of rendering the services. Thus, for example, Spain would not tax the compensation of a U.S. citizen and resident (not a Spanish citizen) who is in Spain to perform services for the U.S. Government, and the United States would not tax the compensation of a Spanish citizen and resident (not a U.S. citizen) who is in the United States to perform services for the Spanish Government.

Any pension paid by, or out of funds created by, a country or one of its political subdivisions or local authorities to an individual for services rendered to that country (or subdivision or authority) generally is taxable only in that country. However, such pensions are

taxable only in the other country if the individual is both a resident and a citizen of that other country.

In the situations described above, the U.S. model treaty allows exclusive taxing jurisdiction to the paying country, but only in the case of payments to one of its citizens.

If a country or one of its political subdivisions or local authorities is carrying on a business (as opposed to functions of a governmental nature), the provisions of Articles 15 (Independent Personal Services), 16 (Dependent Personal Services), 18 (Directors' Fees), 19 (Artistes and Athletes) and 20 (Pensions, Annuities, Alimony, and Child Support) apply, as appropriate, to remuneration and pensions for services rendered in connection with the business.

The provisions of the proposed treaty relating to government service are subject to the provisions of the modified saving clause (Article 1, paragraphs 3 and 4). That is, the general saving clause would apply except with respect to individuals who are neither citizens of, nor have immigrant status in, that country. With respect to the United States, the modified saving clause applies only to U.S. citizens and persons having immigrant status in the United States (i.e., "green card" holders).

ARTICLE 22. STUDENTS AND TRAINEES

Under the proposed treaty, an individual who is a resident of one of the countries at the beginning of his visit to the other country and who is temporarily present in that other country for the primary purpose of studying at a university or other accredited educational institution in that other country, securing training required to qualify him or her to practice a profession or professional specialty, or studying or doing research as a recipient of a grant, allowance, or award from a governmental, religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational organization is exempt from tax in that other country on certain amounts for a period not to exceed five years from the date of his or her arrival in that other country. The exemption applies with respect to payments from abroad, other than compensation for personal services, for the purpose of the person's maintenance, education, study, research, or training. In addition it applies to grants, allowances, or awards, as well as to income from personal services performed in that other country in an aggregate amount not in excess of $5,000 (or its equivalent in Spanish pesetas) for any taxable year.

An exemption also is provided under the proposed treaty with respect to certain personal services income of trainees. The special tax exemption applies to an individual who is a resident of one of the countries at the beginning of his or her visit to the other country and who is temporarily present in that other country as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident of the first-mentioned country, for the primary purpose of either acquiring technical, professional, or business experience from a person other than that employer (or person with whom he or she is under contract), or studying at a university or other accredited educational institution in that other country. In such cases, the person is exempt from tax by that other country for a period of up to 12 consecutive months with

respect to income from personal services in an aggregate amount of no more than $8,000 (or its equivalent in Spanish pesetas).

The proposed treaty specifies that the above rules do not apply to income from the performance of research, if the research is undertaken not in the public interest but primarily for the private benefit of a specific person or persons. Provision 16 of the proposed protocol clarifies that the monetary limits specified above ($5,000 and $8,000) include any amount excluded or exempted from taxation under the laws of the country in which the income is earned (e.g., these amounts would include the $2,000 personal exemption provided under section 151 of the Code).

The students and trainees article of the proposed treaty is subject to the provisions of the modified saving clause (Article 1, paragraphs 3 and 4). That is, the general saving clause applies except with respect to individuals who are neither citizens of, nor have immigrant status in, that country. With respect to the United States, the modified saving clause applies only to U.S. citizens and persons having immigrant status in the United States (i.e., "green card" holders). Thus, for example, the provisions of Article 22 which exempt a resident of Spain from taxation as a student or trainee in the United States are overridden by the saving clause if that person is either a citizen of the United States or holds a U.S. green card.

ARTICLE 23. OTHER INCOME

This article is a catch-all article intended to cover items of income not specifically covered in other articles, and to assign the right to tax third-country income to only one of the countries.

As a general rule, items of income not otherwise dealt with in the proposed treaty that are derived by residents of either country are taxable only by the country of residence. In general, the proposed treaty thus gives the United States the sole right to tax income arising in a third country and paid to a resident of the United States. If the income is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base in the treaty country that is not the residence country, however, that country may also tax it. In addition, income from real property that is not subject to another treaty provision is taxable only in the country of residence of the person earning the income, whether or not the real property income is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base in the other treaty country. The effect of this provision is to allow the residence country to tax income from real property located in a third country, even if that income somehow is attributable to a permanent establishment or fixed base in the treaty country not of residence.

This provision is subject to the saving clause, so U.S. citizens who are Spanish residents would continue to be subject to U.S. taxation on their worldwide income.

ARTICLE 24. RELIEF FROM DOUBLE TAXATION

Background

One of the two principal purposes for entering into an income tax treaty is to limit double taxation of income earned by a resident of one of the countries that is subject to tax in the other coun-

try. The United States unilaterally seeks to mitigate double taxation by generally allowing U.S. taxpayers to credit the foreign income taxes that they pay against the U.S. tax imposed on their foreign source income. A fundamental premise of the foreign tax credit is that it may not offset the U.S. tax on U.S. source income. Therefore, the foreign tax credit provisions contain a limitation that generally ensures that the foreign tax credit offsets U.S. tax only on foreign source income. Moreover, the foreign tax credit provisions contain rules that prevent U.S. persons from converting U.S. source income into foreign source income through the use of an intermediate foreign payee.

The foreign tax credit limitation generally is computed on a worldwide consolidated basis. Hence, all income taxes paid to all foreign countries are combined to offset U.S. taxes on all foreign income. Separate limitations on the foreign tax credit are provided for oil and gas extraction income, passive income, high withholding tax interest, financial services income, shipping income, dividends from noncontrolled section 902 corporations, DISC dividends, FSC dividends, and taxable income of a FSC attributable to foreign trade income.

Foreign tax credits generally cannot exceed 90 percent of the pre-foreign tax credit tentative minimum tax (determined without regard to the net operating loss deduction). However, no such limitation is imposed on a corporation if more than 50 percent of its stock is owned by U.S. persons, all of its operations are in one foreign country with which the United States has an income tax treaty with information exchange provisions, and certain other requirements are met. The 90-percent alternative minimum tax foreign tax credit limitation, enacted in 1986, overrode contrary provisions of then-existing treaties.

An indirect or "deemed paid" credit is also provided. A U.S. corporation that owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign corporation and receives a dividend from the foreign corporation (or an inclusion of the foreign corporation's income) is deemed to have paid a portion of the foreign income taxes paid or deemed paid by the foreign corporation on its accumulated earnings. These taxes deemed paid by the U.S. corporation are included in its total foreign taxes paid for the year the dividend is received and go into the relevant pool or pools of separate limitation category taxes to be credited.

Unilateral efforts to limit double taxation are imperfect. Because of differences in rules as to when a person is taxable on business income, a business may be taxed by two countries as if it were engaged in business in both countries. Also, a corporation or individual may be treated as a resident of more than one country and be taxed on a worldwide basis by both.

Part of the double taxation problem is dealt with in other articles of the proposed treaty that limit the right of a source country to tax income. This article provides further relief where both Spain and the United States would still tax the same item of income. This article is not subject to the saving clause, so that the country of citizenship or residence waives its overriding taxing jurisdiction to the extent that this article applies.

The proposed treaty provides separate rules for relief from double taxation for the United States and Spain. In addition, it provides special rules covering U.S. citizens resident in Spain.

United States

The proposed treaty contains a provision like that found in many U.S. income tax treaties that the United States will allow a U.S. citizen or resident a foreign tax credit for income taxes paid to Spain. The credit is to be computed in accordance with the provisions of and subject to the limitations of U.S. law (as those provisions and limitations may change from time to time without changing the general principles of the credit).

The proposed treaty also allows the U.S. indirect foreign tax credit (Code sec. 902) to a U.S. corporate shareholder of a Spanish corporation receiving dividends from that corporation if the U.S. company owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of the Spanish corporation. The credit is allowed for Spanish income taxes paid by or on behalf of the Spanish corporation on the profits out of which the dividends are paid.

Spain

The proposed treaty generally provides that in taxing a Spanish resident, Spain may include in its tax base income that the United States may tax under the proposed treaty, but that if Spain does so, it must allow as a deduction from Spanish tax on the income (i.e., as a credit) an amount equal to the income tax actually paid in the United States. This deduction is not to exceed, however, the portion of the Spanish tax, as computed prior to the deduction, which is attributable to the income from the United States. In effect, Spain would limit its foreign tax credit on a per-country basis with respect to the United States under the proposed treaty.

If a dividend is paid by a U.S. company to a company resident in Spain which owns at least 25 percent of the capital of the U.S. company making the distribution,[15] an indirect foreign tax credit is permitted, which operates in a manner similar to the U.S. indirect credit under Code section 902. That is, in addition to taxes paid directly by the recipient of the dividend, the portion of taxes paid by the distributing U.S. company attributable to the profits out of which the dividend is paid is deemed paid by the recipient Spanish company and is available for the foreign tax deduction allowed under the proposed treaty. The recipient company must also gross up the amount of the dividend received by the amount of foreign taxes it is deemed to have paid under this rule. As is the case with direct foreign taxes, the amount of the foreign tax deduction allowable for indirect taxes may not exceed the portion of the pre-deduction Spanish tax that is attributable to the income subject to tax in the United States.

The proposed treaty further provides that in situations where, in accordance with other provisions of the treaty, income derived or

[15] For this purpose, the proposed treaty requires this threshold of ownership to be maintained on a continuous basis during the taxable year in which the dividends are paid as well as during the previous taxable year. If the company paying the dividend was created in such previous taxable year, provision 17 of the proposed protocol clarifies that the previous taxable year is deemed to commence on the date of creation of the company.

capital owned by a resident of Spain is exempt from Spanish tax, Spain is permitted to take such income or capital in account in computing the amount of tax on the remaining income or capital of that person. In such a case, Spain will determine the average rate of tax applicable as if the total income (including exempt income) were taxable and apply that rate to the taxable portion of the total income.

Source rules

In this article, the proposed treaty also provides a source rule for determining when an item of income arises in one of the countries with respect to an individual who is a citizen of the United States and a resident of Spain. This source rule is used for the purpose of allowing relief from double taxation under this article. Such persons are entitled to a credit against U.S. tax liability in the amount of the Spanish tax paid. Thus, Spain generally would have primary taxing jurisdiction over the income of such persons, and the United States would deem the income that Spain taxes on this basis to arise in Spain (for the limited purpose of crediting these Spanish taxes). This U.S. tax credit is not to reduce U.S. taxation on a source basis of such a person's U.S. source income (that is, the U.S. tax imposed on a nonresident, noncitizen with respect to income arising in the United States). This rule will not operate to increase such a person's U.S. foreign tax credit limitation so as to enable him or her to credit any additional non-Spanish taxes.

For situations other than the one specified in the preceding paragraph, or with respect to which the special source rule regarding the taxation of certain stock gains contained in Article 13 applies, the treaty does not provide specific sourcing rules for purposes of determining relief from double taxation.

ARTICLE 25. NON-DISCRIMINATION

The proposed treaty contains a nondiscrimination provision relating to the taxes covered by the treaty similar to provisions which are embodied in other recent U.S. income tax treaties. This nondiscrimination provision applies not just to the taxes that the treaty covers generally, but to all taxes that either country or any of its political or administrative subdivisions or local authorities impose.

In general, under the proposed treaty, one country cannot discriminate by imposing more burdensome taxes (or requirements connected with taxes) on nationals of the other country than on its own nationals in the same circumstances. This provision applies whether or not those nationals are residents of the United States or Spain. For the purposes of U.S. tax, however, a U.S. national who is not a resident of the United States and a Spanish national who is not a resident of the United States are not in the same circumstances, because the U.S. national is subject to U.S. tax on his or her worldwide income.

The proposed treaty adopts the OECD model treaty definition of nationals. Nationals are individuals possessing the citizenship of the United States or Spain and all legal persons deriving their status as such from the laws in force in the United States or Spain.

Under the U.S. model treaty, by comparison, only U.S. citizens qualify as U.S. nationals for purposes of obtaining nondiscrimination benefits.

Similarly, in general, one country cannot impose less favorable taxes on permanent establishments of enterprises of the other country than it imposes on its comparable enterprises. However, a country need not grant to residents of the other country the personal allowances, reliefs, or reductions for taxation purposes on account of civil status or family responsibilities that it grants to its own residents.

The proposed treaty clarifies that nothing in the article on nondiscrimination is construed as preventing either country from imposing a branch profits or branch interest tax.

Each country is required (subject to the arm's-length pricing rules of Articles 9 (Associated Enterprises), 11(7) (Interest), and 12(6) (Royalties)) to allow an enterprise to deduct interest, royalties, and other disbursements paid by the enterprise to a resident of the other country under the same conditions that it allows deductions for such amounts paid to residents of the same country as the payor.

The rules concerning nondiscrimination also apply to enterprises of one country which are owned in whole or in part by residents of the other country. An enterprise resident in one country, the capital of which is wholly or partly owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by one or more residents of the other country, is not to be subject in the country of its residence to any taxation or any connected requirement which is more burdensome than the taxation and connected requirements that the country of its residence imposes or may impose on its enterprises carrying on the same activities but the capital of which is owned or controlled by its residents.

The saving clause (which allows the country of residence or citizenship to tax notwithstanding certain treaty provisions) does not apply to this nondiscrimination article.

ARTICLE 26. MUTUAL AGREEMENT PROCEDURE

The proposed treaty contains the standard mutual agreement provision which authorizes the competent authorities of both the United States and Spain (as defined in Article 3) to consult together to attempt to alleviate individual cases of double taxation not in accordance with the proposed treaty. The saving clause of the proposed treaty does not apply to this article, so that the application of this article may result in waiver (otherwise mandated by a substantive provision of the proposed treaty) of taxing jurisdiction by the country of citizenship or residence.

Generally, under the proposed treaty, a person who considers that the action of the countries or either of them will cause him to pay a tax not in accordance with the treaty may present his case to the competent authority of the country of which he is a resident or national. In such an instance, the case must be presented within five years from the first notification of the action resulting in taxation not in accordance with the provision of the proposed treaty. For this purpose, provision 18 of the proposed protocol specifies that the term "first notification" means, in the case of the United

States, the Notice of Deficiency as provided for under Code section 6212. In the case of Spain, it means the Notification of the Administrative Act of Assessment. For both countries, with respect to taxes at source, the term means the date on which the tax is paid or withheld.

Upon notification, the competent authority makes a determination as to whether the objection appears justified. If the objection appears to be justified and if the competent authority is not itself able to arrive at a satisfactory solution, then that competent authority would endeavor to resolve the case by mutual agreement with the competent authority of the other country, with a view to the avoidance of taxation which is not in accordance with the Convention. The provision requires the waiver of the statute of limitations of either country so as to permit the issuance of a refund or credit notwithstanding the statute of limitations. The provision, however, does not authorize the imposition of additional taxes after the statute of limitations has run.

The competent authorities of the Contracting States are to endeavor to resolve by mutual agreement any difficulties or doubts arising as to the interpretation of application of the treaty. They may also consult together for the elimination of double taxation in cases not provided for in the proposed treaty. In particular, the proposed treaty provides that the competent authorities may consult with one another to reach agreement on the application of the limits imposed on the taxation at source of dividends, interest, and royalties by the respective articles covering those topics (Articles 10, 11, and 12).

The proposed treaty authorizes the competent authorities to communicate with each other directly for purposes of reaching an agreement in the sense of the mutual agreement provisions. These provisions make clear that it is not necessary to go through standard diplomatic channels in order to discuss problems arising in the application of the treaty and also remove any doubt as to restrictions that might otherwise arise by reason of the confidentiality rules of the United States or Spain.

ARTICLE 27. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

This article forms the basis for cooperation between the two countries in their attempts to deal with avoidance or evasion of their respective taxes and to enable them to obtain information so that they can properly administer the proposed treaty. The proposed treaty provides for the exchange of information which is necessary to carry out its provisions or the provisions of the domestic laws of the two countries concerning taxes covered by it insofar as the taxation under those domestic laws thereunder is not contrary to the proposed treaty. In addition, the competent authorities may exchange such information as is necessary to prevent tax evasion or fraud, so long as the tax is covered by the proposed treaty and the resulting taxation is not contrary to it. The exchange of information is not restricted by Article 1 (General Scope). Therefore, the countries could exchange information about third country residents. The proposed treaty, like the U.S. model treaty, provides for

the exchange of information about all taxes imposed by either country (whether or not otherwise covered by the treaty).

Any information exchanged is to be treated as secret in the same manner as information obtained under the domestic laws of the country receiving the information. Exchanged information is to be disclosed only to persons or authorities (including courts and administrative bodies) involved in the assessment, collection, or administration of, the enforcement or prosecution in respect of, or the determination of appeals in relation to, the taxes covered by the treaty. Such persons or authorities could use the information only for such purposes, and may disclose the information in public court proceedings or in judicial decisions. The Committee understands that this provision permits access to taxpayer information to legislative bodies involved in the oversight of the administration of taxes, as well as to their agents. For example, this would cover the U.S. General Accounting Office when it is engaged in a study of the administration of the tax laws pursuant to a Congressional request.

Under the proposed treaty, a country is not required to carry out administrative measures at variance with the laws and administrative practice of either country, to supply information which is not obtainable under the laws or in the normal course of the administration of either country, or to supply information which would disclose any trade, business, industrial, commercial, or professional secret or trade process, or information the disclosure of which would be contrary to public policy.

Provision 19 of the proposed protocol provides that the article on exchange of information and administrative assistance is to be interpreted consistently with the Commentary on the OECD model treaty with respect to the similar article contained in that treaty. Based on information provided by the Treasury Department, the Committee understands that the reference to the Commentary on the OECD model treaty is intended to be interpreted as being consistent with the first sentence of Article 26, paragraph 3 of the U.S. model. That is, if information is requested by one country in accordance with the exchange of information article, the other country is obligated to obtain the information to which the request relates in the same manner and to the same extent as if the tax was its own tax.

Provision 19 of the proposed protocol also states that the competent authorities of the two countries shall, even without being requested to do so, exchange such information as is necessary to ensure that the benefits of the proposed treaty are applied only to those persons who are entitled under the treaty to receive them. Unlike the U.S. model treaty, however, the proposed treaty does not require a country to endeavor to collect any tax on behalf of the other for this purpose.

ARTICLE 28. DIPLOMATIC AGENTS AND CONSULAR OFFICERS

The proposed treaty contains the rule found in other U.S. tax treaties that its provisions are not to affect the privileges of diplomatic agents or consular officials under the general rules of international law or the provisions of special agreements. Accordingly,

the proposed convention will not defeat the exemption from tax which a host country may grant to the salary of diplomatic officials of the other country.

The saving clause (as modified by paragraph 4(b) of Article 1) does not apply to this article, so that, for example, U.S. diplomats who are considered Spanish residents generally are able to receive the benefits of this article with respect to Spanish tax.

ARTICLE 29. ENTRY INTO FORCE

The proposed treaty is subject to ratification in accordance with the applicable procedures of each country and the instruments of ratification are to be exchanged as soon as possible in Washington. In general, the proposed treaty will enter into force when the instruments of ratification are exchanged.

With respect to taxes on dividends, interest, and royalties, the treaty will be effective for amounts paid or credited on or after the first day of the second month next following the date on which the treaty enters into force. With respect to other taxes, the treaty is to be effective for taxable periods beginning on or after January 1 of thing on or after January 1 of the year following the date on which the treaty enters into force.

Provision 20 of the proposed protocol contains a rule requiring the competent authorities of the two countries to consult together regarding the appropriateness of negotiating any modification of the proposed treaty to reflect subsequent substantial changes in the domestic legislation of either country or in their tax relations with third countries. Need for such negotiations might be provoked either by new developments in one of the country's tax treaty negotiating policy or as a consequence of changes which may occur in the supernational systems of integration to which the two countries are parties. For example, if one of the countries revised its treaty policy with respect to rates of withholding taxes, the competent authorities would consult regarding the possibility of extending that revised policy to this treaty.

ARTICLE 30. TERMINATION

The proposed treaty will continue in force indefinitely, but either country may terminate it at any time after five years from its entry into force. Notice of termination must be made through diplomatic channels, and given at least six months before the end of a calendar year.

If termination occurs, it will be effective for taxes chargeable for any taxable year beginning on or after the first day of January in the calendar year next following the year in which notice is given.

IX. Text of the Resolution of Ratification

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, together with a related Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 101-16).

○